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## VISION + INTENT

## VISION + INTENT

As referenced in Section 3.5.5 of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance, Planned Developments are intended to encourage innovative land planning and site design concepts that support a high quality of life and achieve a high quality of development, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and other Town goals and objectives As shown in the following pages, the Dory Meadows Planned Development is structured to embody and support excellence in site design, circulation, environmental protection, and compatibility with neighboring properties. The Planned Development process encourages creativity in the design of development, but in return for this flexibility the expectation is for communities to:

- Promote a vibrant public realm by placing increased emphasis on active ground floor uses, pedestrian-oriented building fa ade design, intensive use of sidewalks, and establishment of public gathering areas.
- Provide for efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets and thereby lowering development and housing costs.
- Promote quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and man-made features, such as trees, estuaries, shorelines, special flood hazard area, and historic features.



## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

How the Planned Development advances the public health, safety, or welfare.
The proposed Planned Development will provide a much-needed supply of housing in a regional market that is chronically undersupplied - resulting in significant housing affordability issues due to skyrocketing home prices. Furthermore, the proposed location of this development will result in a safe and convenient neighborhood within a 5 -minute drive to the Zebulon Community Park, shopping in downtown Zebulon, and a local fire station and EMS station. The development will be within a 10 -minute drive of the local police station and all levels of grade schools. Finally, with over $1 / 3$ rd of the gross acreage retained as open space, the proposed Planned Development will help protect environmental health and promote a more active lifestyle.

## How the proposed Planned Development is appropriate for its proposed location, and is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the Town's adopted policy guidance.

Though this development would constitute a satellite annexation, it abuts a previously approved satellite annexation known as Sidney Creek. Thus, municipal services are already being extended to this area. Furthermore, as indicated in Response \#1, this site is less than a 10 minute drive to the areas schools, downtown shopping, and public safety facilities.

The adopted Future Land Use Map designates this area as Suburban Residential (SR) and identifies one of the Primary Land Use Types for Suburban Residential as, "Planned developments that integrate other housing types (e.g., attached residential such as patio homes or townhomes) [in addition to Detached residential dwellings], with increased open space to preserve an overall suburban character." Thus, the proposed Planned Development with a mix of SFD detached dwellings, attached dwellings, and over $1 / 3$ rd of gross acreage as open space precisely fits the intended use and place type within the SR FLU designation.

Furthermore, this Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[Land Use and Development - Goal 1] - "A land use allocation and pattern that advances Zebulon's objectives of achiever greater housing variety ..with convenient resident access to schools, recreation, shopping and Services."

## - Supporting Statement(s):

- The site is located within a 5-minute drive to Zebulon Community Park, Downtown Zebulon Shopping, Fire Station, and EMS station and less than 10 minutes from Zebulon elementary, middle, and high school.
- The proposed development includes a mix of rear-loaded homes SFD homes, frontloaded SFD homes, and Townhomes, providing a variety of housing options to suit different needs.


## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[Land Use and Development - Goal 3] - "Ongoing and effective collaboration between land use and transportation planning to ensure a well-connected community with adequate means and capacity to accommodate multiple forms of circulation between local destinations."

- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The proposed Planned Development incorporates a new E-W collector road free of driveways, which will ultimately form a new connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis road to the west. This new route will form a travel alternative to the current Perry Curtis Road connection to Chamblee road - one with significantly improved access management and which aligns through the Planned Development directly to the Sidney Creek subdivision to the east. This new collector road, through its future westward extension, could be designed as the main E-W throughway to Chamblee road in lieu of the current Perry Curtis Road connection, or it could "T" into Perry Curtis Road. This decision could be made in the future based upon traffic needs at that time and with coordination with NCDOT.
[Land Use and Development - Policy C] - "Emphasize compatible intensities and character when evaluating applications involving more intensive and/or non-residential development near existing homes and neighborhoods.
- Supporting Statement(s):
> The proposed Planned Development locates its denser Townhome units closer to Chamblee Road, where existing infrastructure is most capable of serving it. Furthermore, the location of townhomes on the east side of Chamblee Road connects to proposed Townhomes to be established as a future phase of the Sidney Creek development. Detached single family home lots are proposed along most of the project perimeter, where the proposed PD abuts existing subdivisions such as the Perry Creek and Fieldcrest Meadow subdivisions to the south. A riparian buffer and additional undisturbed open space is left along the site's northern boundary where it abuts the Carroll Heights subdivision.
[Land Use and Development - Policy D] - "Promote land use outcomes that further community objectives for preventing traffic congestion, ensuring more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly design, and support expanded and viable public transit options."
- Supporting Statement(s):
> As explained under the response for Goal 3 for Land Use and Development, the proposed E-W collector road will be unloaded with driveways and will enhance both vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity. Additional trail networks within the site's open space will further support recreational bicycle and pedestrian use.


## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[Land Use and Development - Policy E] - "Ensure development design respects the area's environmental assets and resource base, including waterways and their riparian buffers, unique landscapes, and mature tree stands, especially where there is potential for greenway and/or blueway acquisition."

## - Supporting Statement(s):

$>$ As proposed the Dory Meadows Planned Development retains approximately $1 / 3 \mathrm{rd}$ of the site as open space (both passive and active). The site design integrates and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a 5+ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter.
[Land Use and Development - Policy G] - "Ensure that all residential developments have multiple access points for public safety reasons and circulation options."

- Supporting Statement(s):
> The proposed Planned Development has multiple access points along Chamblee Road, connects to a future phase of the Sidney Creek approved development to the east, and connects to Perry Curtis Road via an the existing stub of Ridge Valley Way to the south. Roadway stubs will also be provided in 2 locations along the northern property boundary - to be extended at the time of future development.
[General Policy - G1] - "Land uses should not detract from the enjoyment or value of neighboring properties."
- Supporting Statement(s):
> All proposed uses are residential in nature, abutting existing residential uses or vacant land. At a minimum, a Type B buffer (20' width) is provided along the project perimeter (either as preserved vegetation or new plantings).
[General Policy - G3] - "Adequate transportation access and circulation should be provided for uses that generate large numbers of trips. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be addressed where appropriate."


## - Supporting Material:

$>$ The proposed Planned Development incorporates a new E-W collector road free of driveways, which will ultimately form a new connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis road to the west. This new route will form a travel alternative to the current Perry Curtis Road connection to Chamblee road - one with significantly improved access management and which aligns through the Planned Development directly to the Sidney Creek subdivision to the east.
> Sidewalks shall be provided along all proposed streets and off-street pedestrian trails shall be provided to improve access to the site's natural features and active open spaces.

## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[General Policy - G6] - "Environmentally sensitive areas should be protected, including wildlife habitat areas."

- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The proposed site design avoids any new vehicular crossings of riparian buffers, as well as works around a significant ( 10 acre) wetland area in the southeastern portion of the site. Pedestrian access is provided to these areas to allow for community enjoyment and exposure to nature, but otherwise they are left undisturbed.
[Residential Policy - R1] - "Residential areas should not be located next to heavy industrial areas."
- Supporting Statement(s):
> All adjacent zoning and existing uses are residential or agricultural in nature. No industrial areas are located adjacent to the proposed planned development.
[Residential Policy - R3] - "Schools, parks and community facilities should be located close to or within residential neighborhoods.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The site has over 4 acres of private/active open space proposed within the residential neighborhood.
> The site is within a 5 -minute drive to Zebulon Community Park, Downtown Zebulon Shopping, a Fire Station, and an EMS station.
$>$ The site is less than a 10-minute drive to elementary, middle, and high schools.
[Residential Policy - R4] - "Houses should have direct access to local residential streets but not to collector streets or thoroughfares.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ No driveways are located along the site's proposed E-W collector road. All dwelling units have direct access to a local residential street or an alley.
[Residential Policy - R7] - "New residential developments should include adequate area for parks and recreation facilities, schools and places of worship.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The site has over 40 acres open spaces, including over 3 acres of private, active open space.
[Parks and Open space Policy - P5] - "Natural features should be used as buffers or preserved open space between or around developed areas."
- Supporting Statement(s):
> The proposed Planned Development utilizes both riparian buffers and wooded woodlands to provide natural buffers between developed areas.


## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

How the proposed Planned Development is reasonable and in the public interest. As indicated in the previous response statements, the proposed uses and density is aligned with the adopted Future Land Use Map and place types intended for the suburban residential designation. The site is adjacent to an large existing satellite annexation, meaning urban services have already been extended to this area and the extension of those services to this development will not incur any disproportionate ongoing costs to service agencies (police, fire, public works, etc.). Finally, the site protects a significant amount of natural areas, while providing an east-west collector road free of driveways to facilitate connectivity and ease the amount of traffic utilizing a portion of Perry Curtis road which does not have nearly as good access management as the proposed development.

## How the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for innovative land planning and site design concepts that support a high quality of life and achieve a high quality of development, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and other Town goals and objectives.

The propose Planned Development utilizes the natural features of the site as an asset to be built around, rather than as an obstacle to overcome. The site design integrates and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a 5+ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter. Existing wetlands and riparian buffers are preserved and used along the northern and southern property boundaries as natural perimeter buffers.

The proposed E-W collector street provides improved access and connectivity at a scale that does not split the community in terms of pedestrian cross-access. Furthermore, the absence of driveways along this collector street allows for a much more aesthetically pleasing and pedestrian friendly streetscape for the development's primary connecting street.

## How the how the proposed planned unit development provides improved means of access, open space, and design amenities.

The proposed layout provides 4 points of access along Chamblee Road, 3 local street stubs to be extended when future development is proposed, a connection which aligns with the proposed Sidney Creek street layout to the east and will provide direct access to Chamblee Road for this adjacent development, and a new collector street that when extended through 1 additional property to the west will provide an improved alternative to a portion of Perry Curtis Road for east-west movement.

Active open spaces are distributed throughout the development for convenient access and are located along the site's major internal roadway. The main amenity utilizes the large existing lake as a significant site feature. Architectural design standards are proffered for the development, as outlined in the Planned Development document.

## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

How the proposed Planned Unit Development provides a well-integrated mix of residential and nonresidential land uses in the same development, including a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and densities.
Due to the future land use plan's Suburban Residential' designation for this area, non-residential land uses are not included in the overall layout. However, the site does include a mix of housing types, lot sizes, lot orientations, and densities in the form of single family detached dwellings and townhomes. Details on dimensional standards for the sites different residential products are contained in a later section of this document.

## How the proposed Planned Unit Development creates a system of incentives for redevelopment and infill in order to revitalize established areas.

The proposed development is primarily surrounded by vacant land, creating an incentive for development' rather than redevelopment', as roadway and utility extensions included as part of this project make adjacent development more viable. Redevelopment opportunities in this area would likely be more limited to potential future pedestrian improvements in an existing adjacent neighborhood.

How the proposed Planned Unit Development promotes a vibrant public realm by placing increased emphasis on active ground floor uses, pedestrian-oriented building façade design, intensive use of sidewalks, and establishment of public gathering areas.

The layout for the proposed development is intentional in terms of its creation of public gathering areas in the form of active and passive open spaces. The primary amenity is centrally located within the development along the site's primary internal road and backing up to a large lake. This amenity will serve as the heart of this neighborhood, where both formal and informal events are held.

In addition to the site's active open spaces, the proposed Planned Development will have an extensive pedestrian trail system that facilitates the use of it's public gathering areas. All local new roads shall have sidewalks on both sides.

## How the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets and thereby lowering development and housing costs.

The proposed layout preserves approximately $1 / 3$ rd of its acreage as passive or active open space. The result of this type of layout is a more condensed development pattern with smaller lots served by less linear feet of infrastructure, surrounded by a significant amount of common open space in lieu of larger individual yards. The interconnected road network is only limited by the numerous environmental features which this site must accommodate.

## THE DORY MEADOWS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

How the the proposed Planned Unit Development provides quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and manmade features, such as trees, estuaries, shorelines, special flood hazard area, and historic features.
As mentioned in previous responses, the site design preserves and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a $5+$ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter.

Existing wetlands and riparian buffers are preserved and used along the northern and southern property boundaries in locations as natural perimeter buffers. Where these existing features are not present along the project perimeter, a minimum Type B Buffer is proposed.

To better align with nearby development, the site's Townhomes are clustered on the eastern side of the development, adjacent to approved Townhomes to be built as part of the Sidney Creek development.

## Other factors as the Board of Commissioners may determine to be relevant.

The inclusion of some front-loaded townhomes within the development helps create a more diverse and economically resilient residential offering and supports housing affordability by avoiding costs associated with rear-loaded alleys within this segment.

Please refer to the associated Planned Development document for more information on proposed architectural conditions.


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## EXISTING CONDITIONS SUMMARY

The Dory Meadows Planned Development is located on a single parcel (+/- 136-acres) near the intersection of Chamblee Rd and Perry Curtis Road ,along the southeastern boundary of Zebulon's zoning jurisdiction. The site is currently in Wake County's zoning jurisdiction, but a petition for annexation accompanies this rezoning request. The parcel is divided by Chamblee Road, with the majority of the site located to the west of Chamblee Road. The site is located generally between Snipes Creek to the west and Little Creek (west side) to the east, with both riparian buffers and jurisdcitional wetlands on site. The most prominent environmental features include a $+/-6$ acre pond located on the western side of Chamblee Road and a 10+ acre wetland area located along the southern property line. This project is free of any floodplain. The site generally slopes eastwards towards Little Creek, with some internal variation within the boundary. Two jurisdictional streams will be preserved during development with no vehicular stream crossings proposed. Current land cover includes large stands of trees and cleared fields used for agricultural purposes.

## VICINITY MAP



## CURRENT ZONING MAP
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## PLANNED DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

## PLANNED DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN

## DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

Dory Meadows is planned as a mixed-residential development consisting of a 362 units, designed to the Planned Development standards of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance. Due to the site's proposed density of less than 3 DUA, the development shall use the R4 district as the base zoning of it's planned development, except as modified by this document. Dory Meadows will provide a variety of housing choices for future residents as well as well-designed and multi-functional recreational amenities. The development will establish bicycle and pedestrian connections between proposed site amenities, while preserving a significant amount of natural areas comprised of wetlands, riparian buffers, and a sizable existing pond. Permitted uses shall be limited to single family detached dwellings, attached single family dwellings (townhomes), and customary residential accessory uses.

## DEVELOPMENT MIX

Maximum \# of Units Estimated Percentage of Dev.

- Single Family Dwellings
231
63.6\%
- Townhomes
131
36.4\%


## DORY MEADOWS COMMUNITY CONCEPT PLAN



## FRONT LOADED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS

## MODIFICATIONS TO UDO STANDARDS

The Town of Zebulon UDO requires that any lot less than 70 ' in width be accessed via rear lane access (or side on a corner lot) and that any SFD detached lot within the R4 district be a minimum of 6000 sq. feet or more in size (depending on whether the development complies with residential design guidelines or follows Conservation Subdivision. In order to accommodate a more compact design that supports preservation of environmental sensitive features, this project would permit front-loading of lots 40 ' and larger and SFD detached lots with a minimum lot size of 4500 sq . ft. The majority of front-loaded lots shall be 60' or larger, as shown in the associated Concept Plan. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval.

To encourage interaction between the public and private realm, front-loaded single-family dwellings in Dory Meadows will permit a minimum front setback of 20' feet, rather than the UDO requirement of 30 feet. Side and rear setbacks are also reduced compared to typical R4 requirements, as indicated below.

## FRONT LOADED SFD DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

> Min. Lot Area
> Min. Lot Width
> Front Setback (min)
> Side Setback (min)
> Corner Setback (min)
> Rear Setback (min)
> Maximum building height

4500 sf
$40^{\prime}$
$20^{\prime}$
$3^{\prime}$ for 40' wide lot / 5 ' for 60' wide lot
Min. Side Setback +10 ft
20
35' / 3 stories

## REAR LOADED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS

## MODIFICATIONS TO UDO STANDARDS

The Town of Zebulon UDO requires that any lot within the R4 district be a minimum of 6000 sq. feet or more in size (depending on whether the development complies with residential design guidelines or follows Conservation Subdivision. In order to accommodate a more compact design that supports preservation of environmental sensitive features, this project would permit rear-loading of lots 40' wide and larger and SFD detached lots with a minimum lot size of 4500 sq . ft. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval.

To encourage interaction between the public and private realm, rear-loaded single-family dwellings in Dory Meadows will permit a minimum front setback of 10 feet, rather than the UDO requirement of 30 feet. Side and rear setbacks are also reduced compared to typical R4 requirements, as indicated below.

## REAR LOADED SFD DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

> Min. Lot Area<br>> Min. Lot Width<br>> Front Setback (min)<br>> Side Setback (min)<br>> Corner Setback (min)<br>> Rear Setback (min)<br>> Max Height

4500 sf
40$10^{\prime}$

3 ' for 40 ' wide lot / 5 ' for $60^{\prime}$ wide lot
Min. Side Setback +10 ft
$20^{\prime}$
35 / 3 stories

## TOWNHOUSES

## MODIFICATIONS TO UDO STANDARDS

The Town of Zebulon UDO provides dimensional standards for attached single family development (i.e.
Townhomes) based on the entire building unit. Rather than apply dimensional standards based on the entire Townhome building, Dory Meadows shall adhere to the following dimensional standards for each individual townhome lot (and be exempt from the dimensional standards contained in Section 3.3.4 of the UDO). Townhomes within Dory Meadows will be a mix of front-loaded and rear-loaded options. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval, and hereby limits townhome buildings to no more than 6 consecutive townhome lots.

## TOWNHOUSE DWELLING DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

- Min. Lot Area
- Min. Street Setback (front or corner)
- Min. Side Setback
- Min. Rear Setback
- Min. Building Separation
- Max Building Height
- Min. Lot Width

2000 SF
5 ' (20' for face of garage on front-loaded units)

## N/A

## 20'

10'
42' / 3 stories
20' (24' for end units)

## ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STANDARDS (Voluntary Commitments)

Dory Meadows offers the following architectural design standards as they relate to detached and attached single family homes:

1. All single-family detached homes with crawl spaces shall have the front of the crawlspace wrapped in brick or stone.
2. All single - family homes with stem wall or slab foundations will contain a minimum of 2 stair risers (12 inches) up to the front porch and the front of the foundation will be wrapped in either brick or stone.
3. All single - family homes and townhomes will have a one or more of the following materials on the front facade (not including foundation): stone, brick, lap siding, cementitious siding, shakes or board and batten. The exterior siding material on the side and rear facades will be fiber cement. When two materials are used, the materials shall be different but complementary colors. Vinyl may be used only for soffits, fascia and corner boards.
4. Vinyl siding shall not be permitted. However vinyl windows, decorative elements and trim are permitted.
5. Single Family main roof pitches (excluding porches) fronting the street for 2 - story homes will be at least 6: 12 .
6. Single family main roof pitches (excluding porches) fronting the street for 1 - story and 1.5 - story homes will be at least $6: 12$ unless an alternate is approved by staff.
7. Townhome roof pitches will be at least 6:12.
8. Garages will not protrude more than 6 feet from the front porch or stoop, and all garage doors shall contain window inserts.
9. Eaves, front and rear, shall project a minimum of 6 ". Side eaves shall be a min of 4 ". Eaves will be allowed to encroach into required setbacks.
10. No two adjacent residential units (side-by-side) shall have identical front facade colors. Color schemes of townhome buildings will be different from one building to the next.

## Example Building Elevations

The following example building elevations are representative of the type of design features intended for SFD detached and attached homes in Dory Meadows, in keeping with the architectural standards committed to as part of the zoning approval. For review of submitted building permits to follow, the list of architectural commitments should be used as the regulatory standard for approval.

Front-Loaded SFD Example Elevations


## Front－Loaded SFD Example Elevations



Rear-Loaded SFD Example Elevations


## Rear-Loaded SFD Example Elevations



Townhome Example Elevations



## ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STANDARDS (Voluntary Commitments)

Dory Meadows offers the following architectural design standards as they relate to detached and attached single family homes:

1. All single-family detached homes with crawl spaces shall have the front of the crawlspace wrapped in brick or stone.
2. All single - family homes with stem wall or slab foundations will contain a minimum of 2 stair risers (12 inches) up to the front porch and the front of the foundation will be wrapped in either brick or stone.
3. All single - family homes and townhomes will have a one or more of the following materials on the front facade (not including foundation): stone, brick, lap siding, cementitious siding, shakes or board and batten. The exterior siding material on the side and rear facades will be fiber cement. When two materials are used, the materials shall be different but complementary colors. Vinyl may be used only for soffits, fascia and corner boards.
4. Vinyl siding shall not be permitted. However vinyl windows, decorative elements and trim are permitted.
5. Single Family main roof pitches (excluding porches) fronting the street for 2 - story homes will be at least 6: 12 .
6. Single family main roof pitches (excluding porches) fronting the street for 1 - story and 1.5 - story homes will be at least $6: 12$ unless an alternate is approved by staff.
7. Townhome roof pitches will be at least 6:12.
8. Garages will not protrude more than 6 feet from the front porch or stoop, and all garage doors shall contain window inserts.
9. Eaves, front and rear, shall project a minimum of 6 ". Side eaves shall be a min of 4 ". Eaves will be allowed to encroach into required setbacks.
10. No two adjacent residential units (side-by-side) shall have identical front facade colors. Color schemes of townhome buildings will be different from one building to the next.


4 PLAN CONSISTENCY I

## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY

As previously stated in the 'legislative considerations' section of this narrative document, this rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use Map (the "FLUM") and many goals and recommendations of the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

The adopted Future Land Use Map designates this area as Suburban Residential (SR) and identifies one of the Primary Land Use Types for Suburban Residential as, "Planned developments that integrate other housing types (e.g., attached residential such as patio homes or townhomes) [in addition to Detached residential dwellings], with increased open space to preservean overall suburban character."

Thus, the proposed Planned Development with a mix of SFD detached dwellings, attached dwellings, and over one third of gross acreage as open space precisely fits the intended use and place type within the Suburban Residential (SR) Future Land Use designation. It is also worth noting that the proposed site abuts a 'General Residential' (GR) Future Land Use area to the east, which is meant to support even more intense residential uses than Suburban Residential.


Suburban Residential (SR)
General Residential (GR)

## LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed development is limited to detached single family detached lots and attached single family lots (aka townhouses). These proposed uses, and the development standards restricting those uses, are compatible with the adjacent communities, which are zoned and/or currently used for low to medium density residential uses.

The proposed development standards defined within this document and the associated concept plan will ensure quality of design across the entire development. The overall site layout is designed to create a cohesive environment by positioning the more dense residential uses along Chamblee Rd, adjacent to proposed Townhomes in the approved Sidney Creek subdivision. The site transitions to lower density single family homes along the edges of the community, and utilizes environmental features as natural buffers to adjoining property. The concept plan features a creative integration of residential uses, active open space, and preserved open space to create a cohesive environment. The design guidelines will ensure quality architectural features that are consistent across the community.

## COMPLIANCE WITH ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The Town's adopted 2045 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) includes a proposed 4-lane divided new roadway which appears to traverse the northern portion of this property (west of Chamblee Road). This proposed roadway runs roughly parallel to Temple Johnson Road to the north and would provide traffic relief to a portion of Perry Curtis Road by forming an alternative connection to Chamblee Road.

In recognition of this planned CTP road, Dory Meadows incorporates an E-W collector road through this site generally in alignment with the CTP roadway (shifted to the south so as to avoid the existing pond). Shifting this road to the south to avoid environmentally protected areas brought it even closer to the existing Perry Curtis Road. Based on the analysis and results of the TIA provided for this development specifically, the necessary placement of this road closer to Perry Curtis Road, and the analysis conducted within the Town's Adopted CTP plan, the applicant sees no cause or justification for a 4-lane roadway in this location. Per the Town of Zebulon's Future 2045 Roadway Deficiency Map, Perry Curtis Road is shown as being 'Under Capacity' without any new roadway construction. Dory Meadows would provide a new 2-lane collector road with dedicated bike lanes, free of any residential driveways - creating an alternative route to Perry Curtis Road with better access management. Thus, it would help alleviate traffic congestion on Perry Curtis Road.


## ZONNG CONDITIONS / REQUESTED DEVIATIONS

## UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) CONSISTENCY

Dory Meadows has been designed to meet the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance where practical and achievable. There are some instances where due to site constraints or desires to maximize open space preservation or housing affordability through more compact design, it is reasonable to deviate from the specific requirements of the Ordinance. In those instances, the applicant is proposing design alternatives that will meet the intent of the Ordinance. The requested modifications to the requirements of the UDO, and the proposed alternative methods of compliance, are listed below.

## MODIFICATIONS TO DRIVEWAY ORIENTATION / ACCESS

The Town of Zebulon UDO requires that any lot less than $70^{\prime}$ in width be accessed via rear lane access (or side on a corner lot).

- In order to accommodate a more compact design that supports preservation of environmental sensitive features, this project would permit front-loading of SFD detached lots 40' and larger (the majority of frontloading homes shall be 60' or wider). The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval.


## MODIFICATIONS TO SFD DETACHED LOT DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

To facilitate a more compact design and support preservation of open space and environmental sensitive features, Dory Meadows proposes the following modifications to SFD dimensional standards (based on the R4 district). The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for all SFD as a condition of the zoning approval.

|  | UDO Requirement (R4) | Proposed Standard | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min Lot Area | $6000+\mathrm{SF}$ | 4500 SF | 6000 SF allowed in Conservation Sub. |
| Min Lot Width | $70^{\prime}$ | $40^{\prime}$ | Majority of FL lots are Min. $60^{\prime}$ |
| Front Setback $(\mathrm{min})$ | $30^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}\left(10^{\prime}\right.$ for Rear-Load SFD) | $20^{\prime}$ normally allowed for porch |
| Rear Setback $(\mathrm{min})$ | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $5^{\prime}$ allowed in Conservation Subdiv. |
| Side Setback $(\mathrm{min})$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $3^{\prime}$ or $5^{\prime}$ (based on lot width) | $5^{\prime}$ allowed in Conservation Subdiv. |
| Raised Entrance $(\mathrm{min})$ | 18 inches | 12 inches |  |

## MODIFICATIONSTO TOWNHOME DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

To facilitate a more compact design and support preservation of open space and environmental sensitive features, Dory Meadows proposes custom Townhome dimensional standards, based on individual townhome lots, rather than townhome buildings. These custom Townhome dimensional standards are contained within Section 3 of this document, and copied below for reference.

## TOWNHOUSE DWELLING DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

- Min. Lot Area
- Min. Street Setback (front or corner)
- Min. Side Setback
- Min. Rear Setback
- Min. Building Separation
- Max Building Height
- Min. Lot Width


## 2000 SF

$5^{\prime}$ (20' for face of garage on front-loaded units) N/A
$20^{\prime}$
$10^{\prime}$
42' / 3 stories
$20^{\prime}$ (24' for end units)

## UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) CONSISTENCY

## MODIFICATIONS TO COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CTP) ROADWAY WIDTH

The adopted Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) calls for a 4-lane divided roadway to traverse the northern portion of this property, west of Chamblee Road. As explained in the 'Plan Consistency' section of this document, there is strong justification for a smaller road section to be applied. As such, this planned development shows a proposd 2-lane collector road with bike lanes generally following the plan's E-W alignment (shifted south to avoid existing protected environmental features).

## MODIFICATIONS TOMAX LOT COVERAGE

Typical UDO standards for the R4 district would apply a maximum lot coverage of $35 \%$ (or $75 \%$ in a Conservation Subdivision). Rather than apply a per lot Lot Coverage max, Dory Meadows will apply a 35\% maximum impervious requirement for the development as a whole (based on total acreage).


## 6 <br> TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

## TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted by McAdams for the proposed development in accordance with the Zebulon (Town) Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) capacity analysis guidelines. A full copy of the TIA will be submitted for review and approval with the PD submittal. A summary of the recommended traffic improvements is provided on the following page for reference.

## STUDY AREA

The study area for the TIA was determined through coordination with the Town and NCDOT and consists of the following existing intersections:

> Chamblee Road/ E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road<br>$>$ NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road<br>> NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road<br>> Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court<br>> Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way<br>> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road<br>> NC 39 and Wake County Line Road<br>> NC 39 and Old US 264<br>> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1<br>> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2<br>> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3

## RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Based on the analysis of the TIA (including improvements to be installed by the adjacent Sidney Creek development), the following improvements have been recommended to be constructed by the developer to mitigate traffic impacts by the proposed development.

Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1
> Construct Site Drive \#1 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.

- Note: This intersection will be restricted to right-in/right-out operations.
$>$ Provide stop control on the westbound approach of the site drive.


## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2

> Construct Site Drive \#2 with a full movement eastbound and westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane each, respectively.
$>$ Provide stop control on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the site drives.
Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3
> Construct Site Drive \#3 as a full movement eastbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
$>$ Provide stop control on the eastbound approach of the site drive.


## 7 <br> RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE + AMENITIES

## RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE AND AMENITIES

Dory Meadows will provide a diverse offering of active and passive recreation areas within the development. In total, over $33 \%$ of the gross acreage will be set aside as some form of open space.

## Open Space Standards

, Total open space required:
> Total open space provided:


### 13.6 Acres (10\% gross site area)

+/-55 Acres

Dory Meadow's recreational open space will be anchored by a primary amenity site centrally located along a new E-W collector road, utilizing a large existing pond as the backdrop to this active open space. A pedestrian trail network will circle the existing pond, and supporting park spaces will be provided to the east and west for convenient access for all neighborhood residents (including the portion on the east side of Chamblee Road). The primary amenity site will incorporate a pool and clubhouse, while the site's other active open spaces shall incorporate such elements as trails, playgrounds, a dog park, and outdoor living space.
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## INFRASTRUCTURE

## STREETS + SIDEWALKS

All streets within Dory Meadows shall be designed to meet the standards of the Town of Zebulon, except as otherwise modified by this document or its associated concept plan set.

- Frontage along Chamblee Road shall be improved to the Town's ultimate cross-section along the project's half of the centerline.
- Due to the site's very limited frontage on Perry Curtis Road, a fee in lieu of widening is requested.
- All proposed roads shall be public right-of-way.
- All proposed roads shall have sidewalks on both sides of the road.


## STORMWATER

The proposed development will require stormwater management measures for quality and quantity treatment in accordance with the Town of Zebulon's adopted stomwater ordinance (enforced by Wake County). A network of storm drainage conveyances will transport storm drainage from impervious areas to the proposed Stormwater Control Measures (SCM). Preliminary locations of these SCMS are provided in the Concept Plan which accompanies this planned development request, based on existing drainage basins. Location and adequate sizing for these devices will be verified during final design. All stormwater management will be required to meet North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality and Town of Zebulon design requirements at the time of site construction drawing submittal.

## WATER \& SEWER

There are two existing waterline stubs to the south side of the Town of Wendell. Each stub is a 6 " main, one being on the south side of the Zebulon Community Park of South Arendell Avenue (HWY 96) and the other is stubbed 500 ' south of the intersection of East Horton Street and the Norfolk Southern Rail right of way. In either case, a 12 " water main would tie to the 6 " stub and extend to the property from the south side of the Town of Wendell. The preferred alignment would be to utilize the HWY 96 NCDOT right of way and extend the watermain on the north side of Perry Curtis Road to the subject property. That water main would pass through the subject site and connect to an existing 12 " water main stub that was placed with the Sydney Creek Subdivision east of the subject development. The Sydney Creek site pulls water from the CORPUD water network existing off Old US HWY 264. This site, Chamblee Road, will create a grid network with two feeds, providing a much great resiliency in this southern side of Zebulon on the very outer reach of CORPUD's distribution system.

There is an existing waste water treatment facility that the Town of Zebulon built along the Little Creek system (Little Creek WWTP) that CORPUD assumed control/ownership over when the merger happened in the early 2000's. From the existing WWTP, there is a sewer main that runs west of the little creek WWTP to serve the Sydney Creek subdivision. This 8" sewer main ties to the upstream receiving SSMH for the WWTP, and then runs over the creek to serve the wester side of this creek. The Chamblee Road site can gravity sewer to an existing 8" stub that is proposed with the Sydney Creek Phase 2 development approved by CORPUD. A sewer analysis is being performed to validate the capacity of this existing 8 " sewer system. It is envisioned that the entirety of the proposed development will be served by the 8 " sewer stub and any ensuing upsizing of that receiving gravity line that ties directly to the Little Creek WWTP.

# REZONING OF PROPERTY CONSISTING OF +/- 136 ACRES, LOCATED ALONG CHAMBLEE ROAD AND PERRY CURTIS ROAD, IN THE TOWN OF ZEBULON 

REPORT OF NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING WITH NEIGHBORING PROPERTY OWNERS AND TENANTS<br>ON OCTOBER 17, 2022

Pursuant to applicable provisions of the Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance, a neighborhood meeting was held with respect to a potential rezoning with neighboring property owners and tenants on Monday, October 17, 2021, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The property considered for this potential rezoning totals approximately 136 acres, and is located along Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road, in the Town of Zebulon, having Wake County Parcel Identification No. 2715101559. This meeting was held at the Zebulon Community Center ( 301 S Arendell Ave, Zebulon, NC 27597) from 5:00pm to 7:00pm. All owners and tenants of property within 300 feet of the subject property were invited to attend the meeting.

Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a copy of the neighborhood meeting notice. A copy of the required mailing list for the meeting invitations is attached hereto as Exhibit B. The sing-in sheet showing the individuals who attended the meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit C. A summary of the items discussed at the meeting (issue/response sheet) is attached hereto as Exhibit D. The meeting presentation showing zoning maps and reduced plans is attached hereto as Exhibit E. Attached as Exhibit F is the required Affidavit of Conducting a Neighborhood Meeting.

EXHIBIT A - NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

## INFORMATION PACKET FOR NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS

## NOTICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at:
1509 Chamblee Rd, Zebulon NC
$\frac{2715101559}{\text { (Pin Numbers) }}$
in accordance with the Town of Zebulon Neighborhood Meeting procedures. This meeting is intended to be a way for the applicant to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the Town. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is officially submitted. Once an application has been submitted to the Town, it may be tracked using the Interactive Development Map located on the Town of Zebulon website at https://www.townofzebulon.org/services/planning.

A Neighborhood Meeting is requested because this project will include:
$\square$ Conditional Rezoning
$\square$ Planned Unit Development
$\square$ Site Plan within the Downtown Core or Downtown Periphery Zoning Districts
$\square$ Zoning Map Amendment (results in more intensive uses or increased density)
$\square \quad$ Special Use Permit (Quasi-Judicial Hearing)
*Quasi-Judicial Hearing: The Board of Commissioners cannot discuss the project prior to the public hearing.
The following is a description of the proposed (also see attached map(s) and/or plan sheet(s)):
Proposed Planned Development application (R4 base) to support a mixed residential neighborhood with ~ 330 dwelling units (single family detached lots and townhomes) near the intersection of Chamblee Rd and Perry Curtis Rd (136 acre tract). See attached concept plan.

Estimated Submittal Date: November 1, 2022

## MEETING INFORMATION:

Property Owner(s) Name(s) CHAMBLEE, R M HEIRS; C/O Jim Edwards
Applicant(s) McAdams (Engineer; Primary Contact - David Bergmark) \& DR Horton (Developer)
Contact Information (e-mail/phone) bergmark@mcadamsco.com ; 919-449-4005
Meeting Address: 301 S Arendell Ave, Zebulon, NC 27597 (Zebulon Community Center - Yoga Room)
Date of Meeting: Monday October 17, 2022
Time of Meeting: 5PM - 7PM

[^0]
## INFORMATION PACKET FOR NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS

## PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

| Development Contacts: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: Chamblee Rd Planned Development |  | Zoning: Existing R-30; Proposed Planned Development |
| Location: 1509 Chamblee Rd, Zebulon NC |  |  |
| Property PIN(s):2715101559 |  | Acreage/Square Feet: $\sim 136$ acres |
|  |  |  |
| Property Owner: CHAMBLEE, R M HEIRS; C/O Jim Edwards |  |  |
| Address: 2711 ROYSTER ST |  |  |
| City: Raleigh | State: NC | Zip: 27608 |
| Phone: |  | Email: |
|  |  |  |
| Developer: DR Horton (Primary Contact - Jon Holtvedt) |  |  |
| Address: 7208 Falls of Neuse Rd |  |  |
| City: Raleigh | State: NC | Zip: 27615 |
| Phone: 919-809-4207 | Fax: | Email: JHoltvedt@drhorton.com |
|  |  |  |
| Engineer: McAdams (Primary Contact - David Bergmark) |  |  |
| Address: 621 Hillsborough Street, Suite 500 |  |  |
| City: Raleigh | State: NC | Zip: 27603 |
| Phone: 919-449-4005 | Fax: | Email: bergmark@mcadamsco.com |
|  |  |  |
| Builder (if known): |  |  |
| Address: |  |  |
| City: | State: | Zip: |
| Phone: | Fax: | Email: |

## INFORMATION PACKET FOR NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS

## PROVIDING INPUT TO THE PLANNING BOARD OR BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS:

Each Board of Commissioners meeting agenda includes a Public Forum time when anyone is permitted to speak for three (3) minutes on any topic with the exception of items listed as Public Hearings for that meeting. The Board of Commissioners meets on the $1^{\text {st }}$ Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. and Joint Public Hearings are scheduled for the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Monday of every Month. (except for holidays, see schedule of meetings at https://www.townofzebulon.org/agendas-minutes. You may also contact Board of Commissioners at https://www.townofzebulon.org/government/board-commissioners.

## PRIVATE AGREEMENTS AND EASEMENT NEGOTIATION:

The Town of Zebulon cannot enforce private agreements between developers and neighbors and is not a party to the easement and right-of-way negotiation that occurs between developers and neighboring property owners for easements or rights-of-way that are necessary to build the project.

It is recommended that all private agreements be made in writing and that if a property owner feels it necessary, they should obtain private legal counsel in order to protect their interests in both private agreements and during easement negotiations. The only conditions that the Town of Zebulon can enforce are those conditions that are made a part of the conditional zoning of the property by agreement of the developer and the Town. As an example, if a developer offers to build a fence for a neighbor to mitigate some impact, the Town can only enforce the construction of the fence if the fence becomes a condition of the rezoning. This would occur by the developer offering the condition as part of their conditional zoning application package or at the Joint Public Hearing on the conditional zoning and the Town accepting it as a condition. Private agreements regarding a fence being constructed will not be enforced by the Town.

To request that any agreement with a developer is made a part of the conditional zoning at the time of approval, you may ask at the public hearing if the agreement is included in the conditions. If it is not, you may request that the Board of Commissioners not approve the rezoning without the agreement being included in the conditions (note that it is up to Board of Commissioners whether to approve or deny the rezoning but they cannot impose conditions that the applicant does not agree to add). The developer's proposed conditions can be viewed any time after a rezoning is submitted on the Town of Zebulon Interactive Development Map which can be found at: https://www.townofzebulon.org/services/planning/whats-coming-zebulon

## DOCUMENTATION:

Neighbors to a requested new development and/or rezoning are strongly encouraged to fully document (such as through dated photographs) the condition of their property before any work is initiated for the new development. Stormwater controls installed on developed property are not designed to and will likely not remove $100 \%$ of the soil particles transported by stormwater runoff. As a result, creeks and ponds could become cloudy for a period of time after rain events.

## 凹MCADAMS

## Chamblee Rd Planned Dev. - Neighborhood Meeting Agenda

Location: $\quad 301$ S Arendell Ave., Zebulon NC 27597 (Zebulon Community Center - Yoga Room)

Date: October 17, 2022

Time: 5:00 P.M. - 7:00 P.M.

Agenda details:

5:00 PM Welcome \& Introductions

5:05 PM Purpose of the Meeting

5:10 PM Planned Development Review Process

5:15 PM Project Overview
A. Description of Property
B. Current Zoning
C. Policy Guidance
D. Proposed Zoning
E. Future Meetings

5:45 PM Question and Answer Period

7:00 PM Adjourn

Note: Project description will be repeated for those unable to arrive at 5 PM. Handouts with the proposed concept plan will be available at the neighborhood meeting.


Chamblee Rd PD - Vicinity Map
\& Existing Zoning
$\overbrace{1 \text { inch equals } 1,600 \text { feet }}^{0}$

## Disclaimer

iMaps makes every effort to produce and publish the most current and accurate information possible. and are NOT surveys. No warranties, expressed or implied are provided for the data therein, its use,or its interpretation


EXHIBIT B - NOTICE MAILING LIST

| STRICKLAND, FRANCES MARIE STRICKLAND, | LIVERMAN, LORAINE A | SHERROD, THELMA M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROGER L | 1404 CHAMBLEE RD | 1505 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| 1101 FIELD MEADOWS DR | ZEBULON NC 27597-9668 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 |  |  |
| FOUNTAIN, JAMES I III FOUNTAIN, LAURA E | POOLE, JOSHUA | BOONE, CHARLES E |
| 10405 PERRY RIDGE CT | 1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 1509 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 |
| HERNDON, JAMES M | LASKIN, RHONDA ANN | MITCHELL, F WADDELL MITCHELL, JANE H |
| 1521 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 1513 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 504 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 | ZEBULON NC 27597-8877 |
| KILLETTE, PHILLIP KILLETTE, LINDA W | CRENSHAW, BARRY A | KILLETTE, PHILLIP KILLETTE, LINDA W |
| 929 PERRY CURTIS RD | 833 PERRY CURTIS RD | 929 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-8886 | ZEBULON NC 27597-8884 | ZEBULON NC 27597-8886 |
| DOZIER, CLARA RHODES | MITCHELL, FRANK W MITCHELL, JANE H | ROBERTSON, ROBERT J |
| 255 DAVIS RD | 504 PERRY CURTIS RD | 1512 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-7046 | ZEBULON NC 27597-8877 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 |
| PATE FAMILYI LTD PTNRP | KHALIOUI, YOUNES | KIRIAZES, KENNETH E KIRIAZES, MARIE A |
| 2333 ZEBULON RD | 1520 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 10401 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-8155 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 |
| BRODEUR, MADELINE | HINNANT, HULEY JR HINNANT, GERALDINE | SMITH, KENNETH R SMITH, TONYA K |
| 10413 PERRY RIDGE CT | 10409 PERRY RIDGE CT | 10417 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 |
| SESSOMS, SHARON | HERNDON, JAMES M MASSENGILL, COLLEEN J | FAULKNER, AUBREY LEROY FAULKNER, PEGGY |
| 10416 PERRY RIDGE CT |  |  |
|  | 1521 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 10404 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6843 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6843 |
| HINTON, REBECCA H | CHAMBLEE, R M HEIRS ; C/O JIM EDWARDS | GRISWOLD RENTAL \& REAL ESTATE INC |
| 409 S ARENDELL AVE | 2711 ROYSTER ST | 2021 WYNNSCOTT FARM LN |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-2807 | RALEIGH NC 27608-1529 | ZEBULON NC 27597-7392 |
| TORRES, BENITO TORRES, EMMA | HARBAR, LINDA WATKINS, ANGELA | HAUGH, PAUL G HAUGH, HEATHER W |
| 10300 PERRY RIDGE CT | 1501 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 1532 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| ZFBULON NC 27597-6841 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 |


| MOZINGO, JUDY B | JUAREZ, PEDRO CARREON JUAREZ, MARIA | CHAMBLEE, CAROLYN P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 708 PERRY CURTIS RD | DEL | 1922 TRAWICK RD |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-8881 | 1408 CHAMBLEE RD | RALEIGH NC 27604-3839 |
|  | ZEBULON NC 27597-9668 |  |
| SARNA, KERRY RICHARD | LAND, MARK LAND, PAMELA | GONZALEZ, ALFONSO GONZALEZ |
| 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY | 10400 PERRY RIDGE CT | 10303 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6845 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6843 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6842 |
| WILLIAMS, GEORGETTE | KRS AND ASSOCIATES INC | ALVAREZ-CORNEJO, AZUCENA |
| 1413 CHAMBLEE RD | 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY | 1104 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-9669 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6845 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 |
| GORE, KAY | DAN RYAN BUILDERS - NORTH CAROLINA LLC | MCNABB, WILLIAM R |
| 10412 PERRY RIDGE CT |  | 204 W GANNON AVE |
|  | 2099 GAITHER RD STE 600 |  |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6843 | ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018 | ZEBULON NC 27597-2626 |
| FOCA, KIMBERLY | TELLEZ MAGANA, MARIA TERESA | WALL, JODY C |
| 706 PERRY CURTIS RD | 1508 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | 133 W 1ST ST |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-8881 | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | WENDELL NC 27591-7600 |
| BAKER, ASHLEY N | HOAD, RYAN PATRICK HOAD, JAMIE LEIGH | NUNEZ, RICARDO RODRIGUEZ, ANGELICA MARIA |
| 10408 PERRY RIDGE CT | 10421 PERRY RIDGE CT |  |
|  |  | 10301 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6843 | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 |  |
|  |  | ZEBULON NC 27597-6842 |
| OLVERA, RAMON HERNANDEZ | DRSFA LLC |  |
| 1100 FIELD MEADOWS DR | 2099 GAITHER RD STE 600 |  |
| ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 | ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018 |  |

## EXHIBIT C - MEETING ATTENDEES

## INFORMATION PACKET FOR Neighborhood Meetings

## NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET:

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

Project Name: Chamblee Road Planned Development
Meeting Address: 301 S Arendell Ave, Zebulon, NC 27597
Date of Meeting: 10/17/2022 Time of Meeting: 5:00-7:00
Property Owner(s) Names: RM Chamblee \& Heirs
Applicants: McAdams
Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number and email address. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.

| 4 | Name/ Organization | Address | Phone\# | E-mail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sat 1 | Cabolin Chamblete | 1922 TeAwick Td PA | 919-28060092 | chamblee5@amailcout |
| 2 | CHARLIE BOONG + RUT | 1509 Charoll HeTs. | p) $919-215-492$ | - ffurds4@gmatucom |
| 3 | Shilt fendor fillette | 929 Perrey Cuntes red | 919-602-446 | pkillette 4saggmeil-soma |
| 4 | Loraine hiver man | 1404 Chimblee led | 919-758.-564 | -lives ble fahoscon |
| 5 | madelire Buodear | 10413 Perry Rd Ct | 781-354-403 | madelinebrodeuregmanl |
| 6 | fames Fount ain | 10405 Perry Aidgelt | 919-625324 | jiti,io20gmail.com |
| 7 | Ryar Hoad | 10421 Perry pidge | 9192952540 | hoad. ryano gmail |
| 8 | Jane mitchell | 504 Perry Curtis | 919-801-7060 | jane. h.mitchell call.net |
| 9 | Waddell Milchall | Suy Perry Cartiv | $919-971-7174$ | jene.h. milcher patl.net |
| 10 | Tonya Smith | 10417 Perry | 919-219-7288 | tksmith991@gmail.co |
| 11 | Kennett-smith | 10417 Perry Ridge | 919-219-7283 | 4 |
| 12 | - Carreon Benito | 1408 Chomblee Rd | 919-426-9838 | manicapetatane gravl com |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |

Attach Additional Sheets If Necessary.

Carolyo Chanblee -
OWH 40 scees +1322 Chambleerd

## EXHIBIT D - ITEMS DISCUSSED

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third
parties.
Project Name:
Chamblee Road Development
Meeting Address: 301 Arendell Ave, Zebulon, NC 27697
Date of Meeting: 10/17/2022 Time of Meeting: 5:00-7:00
Property Owner(s) Names: RM Chamblee and Heirs
Applicants: McAdams
Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Neighborhood Meeting in the spaces below (attach additional sheets, if necessary). Please state if/how the project has been modified in response to any concerns. The response should not be "Noted" or "No Response". There has to be documentation of what consideration the neighbor's concern was given and justification for why no change was deemed warranted.
Question/ Concern \#1 See Attached.

Applicant Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/ Concern \#2 $\qquad$

Applicant Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/ Concern \#3 $\qquad$

Applicant Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/ Concern \#4 $\qquad$

Applicant Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## 10/17/22 Chamblee Rd Neighborhood Meeting Log

- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over stormwater control along the northern property boundary.
- Response: The development team explained that the proposed development would be subject to a stormwater management plan. The project would have to control postdevelopment runoff such that it did not exceed pre-development runoff levels. The planned stormwater control measures would capture and detain water and then slowly release after rainfall events to prevent flooding.
- Concern / Question: A concern was expressed over involuntary annexation of neighboring property.
- Response: The development team explained that only this developments property was being proposed for annexation. Neighboring tracts are not included. Also, state law makes it nearly impossible for the Town to attempt involuntary annexation, even if they were so inclined.
- Concern / Question: A question was raised over the current R-30 zoning district and what that allows.
- Response: The development team explained that the current R-30 zoning designation was a Wake County zoning designation that allowed residential lots with a minimum lot size of 30,000 sq. ft.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked if this development was associated with the adjacent Sidney Creek development.
- Response: The development team explained that while our project would abut theirs, the projects are not associated with one another. This project has a different developer and builder. We would have to connect to existing planned road stubs.
- Concern / Question: Concerns were expressed over how the proposed connections along Chamblee Road would impact traffic on that road. A resident asked how traffic impacts were studied.
- Response: The development team explained that a Traffic Impact Assessment was required to assess the traffic generated by this site, it's associated impacts, and any improvements which may be required to mitigate those impacts. The TIA would account for other planned developments, existing traffic, and project traffic growth into the future. This report would be reviewed by both the Town and NCDOT.
- Concern / Question: A concern was raised that the new development would impact the ability of existing residents to discharge their fire arms, some of which are higher caliber firearms.
- Response: The development team explained that the new development would be subject to the Town's firearm regulations, but that the existing surrounding development would remain subject to the county's regulations. Residents were encouraged to check the Wake County firearm regulations and contact the county if they had questions.
- Concern / Question: Another resident raised concerns over the level of traffic this development would generate and stated hat DOT did not have any plans to build new roads in this area in the next 10 years
- Response: The development team explained that the TIA's recommended traffic improvements would be funded by developers - NOT DOT or the Town. They explained that many road widening and intersection improvements were conducted by developers as a result of these TIAs, and the private sector could incrementally help provided needed improvements even if DOT didn't have the funding.
- Concern / Question: A resident complained that no Town representative was present at the neighborhood meeting.
- Response: The development team stated that the Town was notified of the meeting, but that Town staff had a lot of their own regular meetings that they were required to attend.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked about the anticipated price target for the homes in the proposed development.
- Response: The development team explained that with the rate of inflation, changing interest rates, and crazy price fluctuations in home prices, it was impossible to anticipate accurate home prices 2 years from now.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked if any environmental study had been conducted.
- Response: The development team stated that environmental studies had been conducted in terms of stream and wetland delineations, which were public record. They stated that additional environmental studies were done to ensure there were no endangered species or protected cultural resources on site. Those studies are not required by the Town and are not public record.
- Concern / Question: A resident stated that stormwater drainage would be a big problem for his development. He said that there were existing perking problems, and that stormwater currently drains south and ponds south of the project.
- Response: The development team explained that stream and wetland delineations were performed on the property. Soil evaluations were performed, and no floodplain was present on the site - though we do have wetlands to avoid or mitigate. Geotechnical engineers would drill locations to test for rock and soils types as well. The project would be subject to strict stormwater regulations.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over stormwater control measure maintenance.
- Response: The development team explained that even after development is completed, ongoing inspections would occur by the County to ensure the stormwater control measures continue to perform up to standard. The HOA established for this community would be responsible for addressing any maintenance issues.
- Concern / Question: A resident living at 1404 Chamblee Road asked how close our development would be to her land.
- Response: The development team explained that she was not a direct adjoiner. There is at least 1 property between her property and our proposed development site.
- Concern / Question: A resident explained that the surrounding neighborhood had tried to get spectrum to add service, but that they hadn't done so. She asked if we would be able to help the existing neighborhood get spectrum services.
- Response: The development team explained that the telecommunication companies controlled where extensions occurred. They explained that the new development
would certainly receive telecommunication service, so that closer proximity could potentially help neighbors get extensions as well.
- Concern / Question: Is the developer extending utilities where neighbors could potentially hook on?
- Response: The development team explained that they would be extending water and sewer to serve the proposed development, which would bring it closer to existing neighbors. However, to hook onto municipal water or sewer, residents would need to petition for annexation.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over turning onto Perry Curtis road with the new traffic and opposed the connection into their neighborhood for traffic seeking the shortest path to Perry Curtis road.
- Response: The development team explained that the TIA recommendations would help address some traffic concerns. Furthermore, once the new collector road was extended to Perry Curtis to the west, when the adjacent parcel develops, then that would become the quickest route to Perry Curtis road. David Bergmark explained that this new eastwest collector road was generally aligned with a proposed road on the Town's long range transportation plan.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concerns related to hunting leases on her land and requested a fence along the northern property boundary.
- Response: The development team said they could evaluate their perimeter buffer, but it was not their intent generally to fence single family homes from other single family homes.
- Concern / Question: Phil Killet expressed concern over water runoff at the southern corner of our tract (west of Chamblee Road), where our plan showed a street stub at the end of a road with Townhomes. He said he already had drainage issues and he was afraid runoff coming down that road would make it worse.
- Response: The development team pointed out that there was a proposed SCM next to that location, but that they would evaluate his concern.
- Plan Change: Based on this concern, the proposed Planned Development was amended to stop the stubbing road just short of the property line, with a small berm to control drainage and a proposed fee in lieu for the $\sim 20^{\prime}$ of unconstructed road. ROW dedication is still proposed to the property line.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern that teenagers would trespass onto her land to the north.
- Response: The development team explained that the project would include a number of planned activity zones to give residents a programmed place to gather and recreate, but ultimately trespassing if it occurs would be a law enforcement manner.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked if these homes were planned to be rented.
- Response: The development team explained that this development was not being set up as a 'built-to-rent' community.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked for details on the proposed buffer along the southern perimeter.
- Response: The development team stated that the proposed buffer is the Town of Zebulon's 20' Type B buffer, which would include a combination of canopy trees, understory trees, and shrubs to create a visual screen at different heights.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked about he intended size and price of homes.
- Response: The development team explained that a development like this would typically include 1-2 story homes with 2-car garages and Cementous siding like Hardie plank.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked about proposed phasing for the project.
- Response: The development team explained that phasing was still being developed, but in general the project would start closer to Chamblee Road before heading west , as sewer would come from the east.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked who would maintain the proposed buffer.
- Response: The development team explained that the neighborhood's HOA would be responsible for maintaining required buffers and open space amenities.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over light pollution caused by the development.
- Response: The development explained that their project would be subject to lighting regulations by the town of Zebulon, both at the property line and regulations related to street lighting fixtures.
- Concern / Question: A resident complained that he Town's police force was underfunded.
- Response: The development team explained that police and fire representatives would be part of the technical review committee that would review these plans. Furthermore, part of the Town's evaluation for annexation would include an analysis of the anticipated taxes that might come in from annexing the property vs. the cost of providing town services to the annexed areas.
- Concern / Question: A resident said that she had been told that this property was subject to use limitations under a land trust.
- Response: The development team said that to the best of their knowledge this land was free of any such encumbrances, but that they would double-check.
- Concern / Question: A resident explained that there was a long-standing path that lead through this property that had been used for decades and asked if this established use would establish legal rights to continue to use the path.
- Response: The development team said they were not aware of any such rights established on this property, and a legal case has to be made for such rights.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern that development would reduce the amount of farmland in the area, since this property was being used for agricultural purposes.
- Response: The development team said they understood this would take this land out of agricultural use, but that was often true when development occurred in more rural or suburban communities.
- Concern / Question: A resident said there was an alligator in the lake on site.
- Response: The development team asked if there really was a gator.
- Concern / Question: A resident provided a handout showing a lawsuit had been issued against DR Horton in Louisana regarding mold damage.
- Response: The development team stated that DR Horton was a large national builder and they could only speak to more local standards and builders.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed flooding concerns on Perry Ridge Ct Road, if the new development's traffic were routed through their development.
- Response: The development team explained that stormwater control regulations required that the level of post-development runoff not exceed the current level of runoff occurring in its undeveloped staff.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concerns over the hours during which construction would occur.
- Response: The development team explained that the proposed development would be restricted by the Town of Zebulon regarding the hours during which construction could occur.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over construction debris and erosion control. She stated this was an issue with the existing Sidney Creek development.
- Response: The development explained that they would be subject to soil and erosion control measures, some of which were specific to the period of initial construction. They said that if there were existing issues, this ultimately came down to a matter of enforcement.


## EXHIBIT E - MEETING PRESENTATION

# 1509 Chamblee Road Development 

Neighborhood Meeting
October 17, 2022

## Meeting Agenda

- Introductions
- Purpose of the Meeting
- Planned Development Review Process
- Description of Property
- Current Zoning
- Policy Guidance
- Proposed Zoning
- Future Meetings
- Questions / Comments



## Overview

- Property consists of 136 acres
- Current Use: Agricultural
- Frontage along Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road
- Current Zoning: R-30 (Wake County)
- Future Land Use: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Proposed Zoning: Planned Development (Zebulon)
- 211 Single Family
- 119 Townhouse


## Vicinity Map



## Existing Conditions



## Current Zoning



## Future Land Use Map



CHAMBLEE RD COMMUNITY CONCEPT PLAN


## Preliminary Zoning Conditions

- The Planned Development Document shall identify zoning conditions and any requested code deviations, such as:
- Primary Uses: SFD \& Townhomes only
- Reduced SFD lot size (min. 4800 SF \& 7200 SF lots; mix of FL \& RL)
- Reduced SFD lot width for front-loaded homes
- Front loaded Townhomes permitted
- Proposed Collector road with No residential driveways
- Architectural conditions
- Min. Open Space well above code requirements
- Streetyard Buffers above code requirements


## Open Space / Recreation

- Nearly $1 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of site retained as Open Space
- Main Amenity along existing lake with Pool, Clubhouse, and Walking Trail.
- Over 15 Acres of Tree Save
- Large Pocket Park in Townhome section east of Chamblee, with smaller pocket parks distributed throughout development.


## Overview

- Property consists of 136 acres
- Current Use: Agricultural
- Frontage along Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road
- Current Zoning: R-30 (Wake County)
- Future Land Use: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Proposed Zoning: Planned Development (Zebulon)
- 211 Single Family
- 119 Townhouse


## COMMENTS/QUESTIONS?

David T Bergmark AICP<br>senior planner, planning + design<br>direct 919.287.0794 mobile 919.449.4005<br>bergmark@mcadamsco.com<br>621 Hill|shorgugh Street Suite 500, Releigh, NC.27603<br>www.mcadansco.com<br>Join Our Team

Samuel Morris
Attorney
Longleaf Law Partners | 4509 Creedmoor Rd, Suite 302, Raleigh, NC 27612 919-780-5438 (Direct) | 919-645-4300 (Main) | smorris@longleaflp.com www.longleaflp.com

EXHIBIT F - AFFIDAVIT OF CONDUCTING A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

INFORMATION PACKET FOR
Neighborhood Meetings

## AFFIDAVIT OF CONDUCTING A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING, SIGN-IN SHEET AND ISSUES/RESPONSES SUBMITTAL

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.


1. I have conducted a Neighborhood Meeting for the proposed Rezoning, Major Site Plan, Master Subdivision Plan, or Special Use Permit.
2. The meeting invitations were mailed to the Zebulon Planning Department, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property and any neighborhood association that represents citizens in the area via first class mail a minimum of 10 days in advance of the Neighborhood Meeting.
3. The meeting was conducted at the Zebulun Common? Center (location/address) on 10/17/2022 (date) from 5:00 pm(start time) to 7:00 pm (end time).
4. I have included the mailing list, meeting invitation, sign-in sheet, issue/response summary, and zoning map/reduced plans with the application.
5. I have prepared these materials in good faith and to the best of my ability.


## state of North Carolina

COUNTY OF wake.

Sworn and subscribed before me, Samuel Morris , a Notary Public for the above State and County, on this the $\qquad$ 20_22.
$\qquad$


Certified List of Property Owners (Wake Co. Real Estate Records) - 200 ft buffer applied (instead of 150) to be conservative. (NOTE: stamped envelopes provided for this full list)

| PIN_NUM | OWNER | ADDR1 | ADDR2 | SITE_ADDRESS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2714081891 | STRICKLAND, FRANCES MARIE STRICKLAND, ROGER L | 1101 FIELD MEADOWS DR | ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 | 1101 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| 2715115366 | LIVERMAN, LORAINE A | 1404 CHAMBLEE RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9668 | 1404 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714193007 | FOUNTAIN, JAMES I III FOUNTAIN, LAURA E | 10405 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10405 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2715215283 | POOLE, JOSHUA | 1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | 1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| 2704984963 | MITCHELL, F WADDELL MITCHELL, JANE H | 504 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8877 | 504 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2714299043 | KILLETTE, PHILLIP KILLETTE, LINDA W | 929 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8886 | 929 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2714282739 | CRENSHAW, BARRY A | 833 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8884 | 833 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2714286726 | KILLETTE, PHILLIP KILLETTE, LINDA W | 929 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8886 | 905 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2715116128 | DOZIER, CLARA RHODES | 255 DAVIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-7046 | 1412 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714080800 | MITCHELL, FRANK W MITCHELL, JANE H | 504 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8877 | 1108 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| 2715214284 | ROBERTSON, ROBERT J | 1512 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | 1512 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| 2705912377 | PATE FAMILY I LTD PTNRP | 2333 ZEBULON RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8155 | 0 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2715217214 | KHALIOUI, YOUNES | 1520 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | 1520 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| 2714191047 | KIRIAZES, KENNETH E KIRIAZES, MARIE A | 10401 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10401 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2714195099 | BRODEUR, MADELINE | 10413 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10413 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2714194057 | HINNANT, HULEY JR HINNANT, GERALDINE | 10409 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10409 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2714197170 | SMITH, KENNETH R SMITH, TONYA K | 10417 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10417 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2704995359 | HINTON, REBECCA H | 409 S ARENDELL AVE | ZEBULON NC 27597-2807 | 612 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2715101559 | CHAMBLEE, R M HEIRS; C/O JIM EDWARDS | 2711 ROYSTER ST | RALEIGH NC 27608-1529 | 1509 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2715211421 | HARBAR, LINDA WATKINS, ANGELA | 1501 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9641 | 1501 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| 2715219341 | HAUGH, PAUL G HAUGH, HEATHER W | 1532 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | 1532 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| 2714083747 | MOZINGO, JUDY B | 708 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8881 | 708 PERRY CURTIS RD |
| 2715116216 | JUAREZ, PEDRO CARREON JUAREZ, MARIA DEL | 1408 CHAMBLEE RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9668 | 1408 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2715019636 | CHAMBLEE, CAROLYN P | 1922 TRAWICK RD | RALEIGH NC 27604-3839 | 0 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714098086 | SARNA, KERRY RICHARD | 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY | ZEBULON NC 27597-6845 | 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY |
| 2714097005 | GONZALEZ, ALFONSO GONZALEZ | 10303 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6842 | 10303 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2715212207 | WILLIAMS, GEORGETTE | 1413 CHAMBLEE RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9669 | 1413 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714080938 | ALVAREZ-CORNEJO, AZUCENA | 1104 FIELD MEADOWS DR | ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 | 1104 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| 2715410167 | DAN RYAN BUILDERS - NORTH CAROLINA LLC | 2099 GAITHER RD STE 600 | ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018 | 0 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714383837 | MCNABB, WILLIAM R | 204 W GANNON AVE | ZEBULON NC 27597-2626 | 0 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714093190 | FOCA, KIMBERLY | 706 PERRY CURTIS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-8881 | 706 PERRY CURTIS RD |


| 2715213285 | TELLEZ MAGANA, MARIA TERESA | 1508 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | 1508 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2715212128 | WALL, JODY C | 133 W 1ST ST | WENDELL NC 27591-7600 | 1417 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714189947 | HOAD, RYAN PATRICK HOAD, JAMIE LEIGH | 10421 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10421 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2714085959 | NUNEZ, RICARDO RODRIGUEZ, ANGELICA MARIA | 10301 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6842 |  |
| 2714091017 | OLVERA, RAMON HERNANDEZ | 1100 FIELD MEADOWS DR | ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 | 1100 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| 2714495712 | DRSFA LLC | 2099 GAITHER RD STE 600 | ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018 | 1701 CHAMBLEE RD |
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## CHAM BLEE PROPERTY >TRAFICIMPACT ANALYSS

## EXEXIIVESUMMARY

The proposed residential development will be located along Chamblee Road north of Perry Curtis Road in Zebulon, North Carolina. Site access will be served via one (1) right-in/right-out driveway and two (2) full movement driveways on Chamblee Road as well as via a connection to the existing Ridge Valley Way which is stubbed to the southern border of the property. The middle site driveway along Chamblee Road is proposed to be aligned across Chamblee Road, providing access to both sides of the development. The site is currently undeveloped and is expected to consist of a maximum of 211 single family homes and 119 townhomes. The proposed site is expected to be built-out by the year 2027. The purpose of this Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is to determine the potential traffic impacts of this development and to identify transportation improvements that may be required to mitigate the impacts on the roadway network.

A Memorandum of Understanding ( MOU ) was reviewed and approved by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Zebulon (Town), outlining the TIA scope and assumptions. The M OU and approval correspondence is provided in the appendix of this study. Based on the approved scoping, the following intersections are included in this TIA study area:
> Chamblee Road/ E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road
> Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court
> Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way
> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road
> NC 39 and Wake County Line Road
> NC 39 and Old US 264
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3
To determine the traffic impacts of the proposed development, the following analysis scenarios are included in this study:
> Existing (2022) Traffic Conditions
> No-Build (2027) Traffic Conditions
> Build (2027) Traffic Conditions
Peak hour traffic counts were conducted at the existing study intersections in June and October 2022 and balanced between study intersections, as appropriate, to determine Existing (2022) traffic volumes. To account for background development growth, a $3 \%$ annual growth rate was applied to the existing traffic volumes and the adjacent development traffic from one approved nearby development, Sidney Creek, was added to determine the No-Build (2027) traffic volumes.

Based on the Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, and the suggested method of trip calculations provided in NCDOT's Rate vs. Equation spreadsheet trips for the proposed development were calculated for weekday daily, weekday AM peak hour, and weekday PM peak hour. A summary of this trip generation is provided in Table ES-1.

TABLEES-1: TRIPGENERATION

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Density | Calculation Methodology | Daily Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (210) | 211 Units | Adjacent / Equation | 2,006 | 38 | 109 | 147 | 126 | 74 | 200 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (215) | 119 Units | Adjacent / Equation | 856 | 17 | 39 | 56 | 38 | 29 | 67 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2,862 | 55 | 148 | 203 | 164 | 103 | 26 |

The peak hour site traffic was distributed throughout the network according to the site trip distribution approved by NCDOT and Town staff within the MOU. This site traffic was added onto the No-Build (2027) traffic volumes to determine the Build (2027) traffic volumes for the capacity analysis.

Capacity analysis was conducted at all study intersections according to NCDOT and Town guidelines utilizing the methodology contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Highway Capacity Manual. Refer to Table ES-2 for a summary of the capacity analysis results.

TABLE ES-2: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

| Intersection | Conditions | AP$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Chamblee Road/E. <br> Horton Street and <br> Temple-Johnson Road | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(9) \\ & A(7) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & \text { A (7) } \\ & --\quad \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | A (9) A (7) | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A |
|  | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ -- | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Temple-Johnson Road and NC 96 | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(11) \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (11) } \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB }{ }^{2} \\ & \text { NB } \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(12) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Perry Curtis Road and NC 96 | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (10) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (10) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{WB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (11) } \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(12) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(13) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{WB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(9) \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | A (9) <br> -- | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A |
|  | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | A (9) A (8) | N/A |
| Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | A (7) <br> -- | N/A | A (7) <br> A (9) | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & A(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |


| - | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | A (7) <br> -- | N/A | A (7) <br> A (9) | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A }(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (8) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (10) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & - \\ & A(10) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(8) \\ & -- \\ & B(11) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Wake County Line Road and NC 39 | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ -- | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (13) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ -- | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(12) \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(14) \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | Build (2027) | $E B^{2}$ $N B^{1}$ $S B$ | $\begin{aligned} & C(17) \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & C(20) \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| NC 39 and Old US 264 | Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & E B^{2} \\ & W^{2} \\ & N B^{1} \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & C(16) \\ & C(21) \\ & A(8) \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & F(76) \\ & D(32) \\ & A(8) \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(38) \\ & D(38) \\ & C(29) \\ & C(25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(43) \\ & D(40) \\ & C(32) \\ & C(29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(39) \\ & D(40) \\ & C(29) \\ & C(25) \end{aligned}$ | C <br> (31) | $\begin{aligned} & D(47) \\ & D(47) \\ & C(32) \\ & C(30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (35) \end{aligned}$ |
| Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1 | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{1} \\ & N B \\ & S B \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | A (9) | N/A | A (9) | N/A |
| Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2 | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{WB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(9) \\ & A(10) \\ & A(7) \\ & A(7) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(10) \\ & \mathrm{B}(10) \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \\ & \mathrm{A}(7) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3 | Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & \text { A (7) } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | A (9) <br> A (8) <br> -- | N/A |

Based on review of adjacent development and background information provided by NCDOT and the Town, the following improvements are expected to be constructed by Sidney Creek and were included in the future year analyses:

## NC 39 and Old US 264

> Monitor for signalization and install once warranted and approved by NCDOT.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 125 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Extend the existing southbound left-turn lane on NC 39 to provide a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Based on the findings in the TIA, the improvements below have been recommended to be constructed by the developer to mitigate traffic impacts by the proposed development:

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1

> Construct Site Drive \#1 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.

- Note: This intersection will be restricted to right-in/right-out operations.
> Provide stop control on the westbound approach of the site drive.


## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2

> Construct Site Drive \#2 with a full movement eastbound and westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane each, respectively.
> Provide stop control on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the site drives.

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3

> Construct Site Drive \#3 as a full movement eastbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
> Provide stop control on the eastbound approach of the site drive.
Figure ES-1, on the following page, provides a graphical representation of recommended improvements at the study intersections.


## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ..... 12
EXISTING CONDITIONS ..... 15
NO-BUILD CONDITIONS ..... 19
BUILD CONDITIONS ..... 23
CAPACITY ANALYSIS ..... 27
CHAMBLEE ROAD + E. HORTON STREET + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD ..... 28
NC 96 + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD ..... 29
NC 96 + PERRY CURTIS ROAD ..... 30
PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT ..... 31
PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY ..... 32
PERRY CURTIS ROAD / WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD ..... 33
NC 39 + WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD ..... 34
NC 39 + OLD US 264 ..... 35
CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1 ..... 37
CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2 ..... 38
CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3 ..... 39
CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 40
FIGURES
FIGURE 1 - SITE LOCATION MAP ..... 13
FIGURE 2 - SITE PLAN ..... 14
FIGURE 3 - EXISTING LANE CONFIGURATIONS ..... 17
FIGURE 4 - EXISTING (2022) TRAFFIC VOLUMES ..... 18
FIGURE 5 - PROJECTED (2027) TRAFFIC VOLUMES ..... 20
FIGURE 6 - ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT SITE TRIPS ..... 21
FIGURE 7 - NO-BUILD (2027) TRAFFIC VOLUMES ..... 22
FIGURE 8 - SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION ..... 24
FIGURE 9 - SITE TRIP ASSIGNMENT ..... 25
FIGURE 10 - BUILD (2027) TRAFFIC VOLUMES ..... 26
FIGURE 11 - RECOMMENDED LANE CONFIGURATIONS ..... 42

## TABLES

TABLE 1: ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS ..... 15
TABLE 2: ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS ..... 19
TABLE 3: TRIP GENERATION ..... 23
TABLE 4: HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL - LEVELS OF SERVICE + DELAY CRITERIA ..... 27
TABLE 5: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD / E. HORTON STREET + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD ..... 28
TABLE 6: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 96 + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD ..... 29
TABLE 7: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 96 + PERRY CURTIS ROAD ..... 30
TABLE 8: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT ..... 31
TABLE 9: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY ..... 32
TABLE 10: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD / WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD ..... 33
TABLE 11: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 39 + WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD ..... 34
TABLE 12: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 39 + OLD US 264 ..... 35
TABLE 13: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1 ..... 37
TABLE 14: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2 ..... 38
TABLE 15: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3. ..... 39

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)
APPENDIX B: COUNT DATA
APPENDIX C: ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION
APPENDIX D: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - CHAMBLEE ROAD / E. HORTON STREET + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD
APPENDIX E: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 96 + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD
APPENDIX F: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 96 + PERRY CURTIS ROAD
APPENDIX G: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT
APPENDIX H: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY
APPENDIX I: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - PERRY CURTIS ROAD / WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD
APPENDIX J: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 39 + WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD
APPENDIX K: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 39 + OLD US 264
APPENDIX L: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1
APPENDIX M: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2
APPENDIX N: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3 APPENDIX O: SIMTRAFFIC REPORTS

APPENDIX P: TURN LANE WARRANTS

# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS CHAMBLEE PROPERTY 

Zebulon, NC

## INTRODUCTION

The proposed residential development will be located along Chamblee Road north of Perry Curtis Road in Zebulon, North Carolina. Site access will be served via one (1) right-in/right-in driveway and two (2) full movement driveways along Chamblee Road as well as via connection to the existing Ridge Valley Way stubbed to the southern border of the property. The middle site driveway along Chamblee Road is proposed to be aligned across Chamblee Road, providing access to both sides of the development. The purpose of this Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is to determine the potential traffic impacts of this development and to identify transportation improvements that may be required to mitigate the impacts on the roadway network. The site is currently undeveloped and is expected to consist of the following land uses at full buildout:
> 211 single family homes
> 119 townhomes
The proposed site is to be built-out by the year 2027. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was reviewed and approved by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Zebulon (Town), outlining the TIA scope and assumptions. The MOU and approval correspondence is provided in Appendix A. Based on the approved scoping; the following intersections are included in this TIA study area:
> Chamblee Road/E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road
$>$ Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court
> Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way
> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road
> NC 39 and Wake County Line Road
> NC 39 and Old US 264
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3
Refer to Figure 1 for a map of the study area. Figure 2 provides the most up to date preliminary site plan available at time of preparation of this study.

To determine the traffic impacts of the proposed development, the following analysis scenarios are included in this study:
> Existing (2022) Traffic Conditions
> No-Build (2027) Traffic Conditions
> Build (2027) Traffic Conditions



## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The proposed development is located in an area primarily consisting of residential development and undeveloped land. Figure 3 provides a graphical representation of the existing lane configuration, storage capacity, traffic control type, and intersection spacing within the study area. Roadway characteristics within the study area is shown in Table 1. Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) data is provided based on the most recent count data provided by NCDOT. This AADT data provides the average Vehicles Per Day (vpd) for the subject facility based on typical operations. This AADT data is provided for informational purposes only and is not utilized for capacity analysis calculations within this study.

| TABLE 1: ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Name | Route \# | Maintained By | Typical Cross Section | Speed <br> Limit | AADT (year of data) |
| NC 39 |  | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 55 mph | 8,500 vpd (2019) |
| NC 96 |  | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 45 mph | 5,600 vpd (2019) |
| Old US 264 | US 264 ALT | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 55 mph | 3,800 vpd (2017) |
| Perry Curtis Road | SR 2347 | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 55 mph | 1,300 vpd (2015) |
| Wake County Line Road | SR 1727 | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 55 mph | 970 vpd (2016) |
| Chamblee Road | SR 2345 | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 35 mph | 830 vpd (2022)* |
| Temple-Johnson Road | SR 2346 | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 55 mph | 220 vpd (2022)* |
| Perry Ridge Court | SR 5417 | NCDOT | 2-lane undivided | 25 mph | 100 vpd (2022)* |
| Ridge Valley Way | N/A | Public | 2-lane undivided | 25 mph | N/A** |

*AADT determined based on Existing (2022) traffic volumes assuming that the weekday PM peak hour accounts for approximately $10 \%$ of the daily traffic on the roadway.
${ }^{* *}$ No AADT data was available or could be determined based on the assumptions outlined in the MOU.
Existing peak hour turning movement counts were conducted in June and October 2022 during a typical weekday AM (7:00-9:00 AM) and weekday PM (4:00-6:00 PM) peak hours while local public schools were in session. This data was collected at the following existing study intersections:
> Chamblee Road/ E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road
> Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court
> Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way
> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road
> NC 39 and Wake County Line Road
> NC 39 and OId US 264
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3
Peak hour traffic volumes were determined from these traffic counts and balanced between study intersections, where appropriate. Per the approved MOU, existing volumes at the intersection of Perry Ridge Court at Ridge Valley Way were pulled through from the adjacent intersection of Perry Curtis Road at Perry Ridge Court. Traffic count data is provided in Appendix B. Refer to Figure 4 for the Existing (2022) peak hour traffic volumes.

The Existing (2022) traffic volumes were analyzed utilizing the current lane configurations to determine existing operations for the study area.



## NO-BUILD CONDITIONS

In order to account for background growth in the study area prior to the proposed developments buildout year of 2022, the existing traffic count volumes were grown at a set growth rate and nearby approved adjacent development traffic was added to the study area based on their approved TIA's. Per the approved MOU, the existing traffic counts were grown at a $3 \%$ annual growth rate to determine projected traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 5 for the Projected (2027) traffic volumes.

To account for the traffic volumes of the adjacent developments approved in the area, the traffic from those developments were also compiled and added to the analysis. The adjacent development traffic volumes are provided on Figure 6. Based on the approved MOU, the following development was included:

| TABLE 2: ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Development Name | Location | Land Use / Density | Build-out Year | Firm Completing |
| Sidney Creek | West of NC 39 along | 565 single-family homes |  |  |
| Chamblee Road | 2029 | RKA |  |  |

According to the Town and NCDOT, the following roadway improvements at the are expected at the intersection of NC 39 and Old US 264 by the Sidney Creek adjacent development:
> Monitor for signalization and install once warranted and approved by NCDOT
> Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 125 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Extend the existing southbound left-turn lane on NC 39 to provide a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Appendix C provides a full summary of the adjacent developments included in this analysis. In order to account for future year analysis without the proposed development, the Projected (2027) traffic volumes were added to the adjacent development trips to determine the No-Build (2027) traffic volumes. Figure 7 provides the No-Build (2027) volumes.




## 凹MCADAMS

## BUILD CONDITIONS

The proposed development is expected to consist of 211 single-family homes and 119 townhomes. Based on the Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, and the suggested method of trip calculations provided in NCDOT's Rate vs. Equation spreadsheet, trips for the proposed development were calculated for weekday daily, weekday AM peak hour, and weekday PM peak hour. A summary of this trip generation is provided in Table 3.

| TABLE 3: TRIP GENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use (ITE Code) | Density | Calculation Methodology | Daily <br> Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (210) | 211 Units | Adjacent / Equation | 2,006 | 38 | 109 | 147 | 126 | 74 | 200 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (215) | 119 Units | Adjacent / Equation | 856 | 17 | 39 | 56 | 38 | 29 | 67 |
| Total |  |  | 2,862 | 55 | 148 | 203 | 164 | 103 | 267 |

Based on the existing traffic patterns, population centers surrounding the development, and engineering judgment the site trips were distributed according to the regional distributions listed as follows:
> $40 \%$ to/from the north via NC 96
> $40 \%$ to/from the north via NC 39
> $15 \%$ to/from the south via Chamblee Road
$>5 \%$ to/from the north via NC 96
Refer to Figure 8 for the detailed trip distribution percentages within the study area. The trip generation and distribution were approved by NCDOT and the Town within the MOU provided in Appendix A.

The trip distribution was applied to the trip generation to determine the trip assignment for the proposed development site trips at all study intersections. Refer to Figure 9 for the site trip assignment. To determine the future traffic volumes at the study intersections with buildout of the proposed site, the No-Build (2027) traffic volumes were added to the site trip assignment to determine Build (2027) traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 10 for the Build (2027) traffic volumes.




## CAPACITY ANALYSIS

The intersections and analysis scenarios included in this study were analyzed to determine the potential impact by the proposed development and to recommend improvements to mitigate any potential impacts. The capacity analysis reviews the level of service (LOS), delay, and vehicle queues expected under each analysis scenario utilizing the methodology contained in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, published by the Transportation Research Board.

LOS is a qualitative measurement of traffic operations based on the average total vehicle delay of the movement, approach, or intersection. The HCM includes six levels of service, ranging from level " A " (free flow conditions) to level " F " (where over-saturated conditions are evident). Table 4 provides a summary of the thresholds for each LOS under both unsignalized (stop-control) and signalized operations.

| TABLE 4: HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL - LEVELS OF SERVICE + DELAY CRITERIA |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Unsignalized |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | Average Control Delay (Seconds per vehicle) | Average Control Delay (Seconds per vehicle) |
| A | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ |
| C | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ |
| D | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ |
| E | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ |
| F | $>50$ | $>80$ |

A computer software package, Synchro (version 11.1), was utilized for the analysis of operations within this study. Within this software package, SimTraffic was also used to review queue lengths and the operations of intersections within the context of location and spacing in the study area. The capacity analysis summary table for each study intersection provides the delay and LOS for each approach and overall intersection, when appropriate. More detailed queues and delay information is provided in the appendix.

Per the NCDOT Congestion Management Capacity Analysis Guidelines, several assumptions were applied to the full study. A summary of these assumptions is provided below:
> A Peak Hour Factor (PHF) of 0.90 was used for all analysis scenarios and intersections.
> A heavy vehicle percentage of $2 \%$ was applied to all analysis scenarios and intersections.
> For allowable movements with volumes less than four (4), a volume of four (4) was applied in the capacity analysis. In order to present accurate information within the traffic volume figures, this was not applied to those conditions.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD / E. HORTON STREET + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD

The intersection of Chamblee Road / E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road is currently an unsignalized, threeleg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 5 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix D for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.


1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of Chamblee Road / E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road is expected to operate at LOS A for both the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## NC 96 + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD

The intersection of NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road is currently an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 6 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix E for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 6: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 96 + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | AP$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & - \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-RT 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(12) \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road is expected to operate at LOS B or better for both the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## NC 96 + PERRY CURTIS ROAD

The intersection of NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road is currently an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 7 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix F for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 7: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 96 + PERRY CURTIS ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & R \\ & O \\ & \text { A } \\ & C \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & B(10) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (10) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & -- \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(12) \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(13) \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road is expected to operate at LOS B or better for both the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT

The intersection of Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court is currently an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 8 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix G for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 8: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & R \\ & O \\ & \text { A } \\ & C \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & W B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-RT <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2} \\ & N B \\ & \text { SB }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-RT <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{WB}{ }^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \end{aligned}$ | A (9) <br> A (8) | N/A | A (9) <br> A (8) | N/A |

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court is expected to operate at LOS A for both the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

This intersection was analyzed with the assumption that site trips from the proposed development may utilize this roadway for access in order to present a conservative analysis. With this assumption, the proposed development is expected to have a negligible impact in delay on the subject intersection.

## PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY

The intersection of Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way is currently an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 9 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix H for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 9: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & R \\ & O \\ & A \\ & C \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & E B^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-RT | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & A(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-RT | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & A(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $E B^{1}$ <br> WB <br> $S B^{2}$ | 1 LT-TH <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-RT | A (7) <br> -- | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way is expected to operate at LOS A for both the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Ridge Valley Way is currently stubbed to the property line for future connection. As such, this intersection was analyzed with the assumption that site trips from the proposed development may utilize this roadway for access in order to present a conservative analysis. With this assumption, the proposed development is expected to have a negligible impact in delay on the subject intersection.

## PERRY CURTIS ROAD / WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD

The intersection of Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road is currently an unsignalized, threeleg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 10 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix I for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 10: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD / WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | AP$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and <br> Approach <br> Delay <br> (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and <br> Approach <br> Delay <br> (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & A(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & E B^{1} \\ & W B \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{TH} \\ & 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{RT} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (8) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (10) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & E B^{1} \\ & W B \\ & S B^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & A(10) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(8) \\ & -- \\ & B(11) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

[^1]Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road is expected to operate at LOS B or better for both the majorstreet left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## NC 39 + WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD

The intersection of NC 39 and Wake County Line Road is currently an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions.

Table 11 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix J for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 11: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 39 + WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & R \\ & O \\ & A \\ & C \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(12) \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (13) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (14) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & --\quad \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C (17) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & C(20) \\ & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the intersection of NC 39 and Wake County Line Road is expected is to operate at LOS C or better for both the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## NC 39 + OLD US 264

The intersection of NC 39 and Old US 264 is currently an unsignalized, four-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions. Based on coordination with Town and NCDOT staff, Sidney Creek is expected to construct improvements at the subject intersection prior to the 2027 buildout of the proposed development. These improvements were included under all future year analyses (No-Build and Build conditions). The improvements included as adjacent development improvements are:
> Monitor for signalization and install once warranted and approved by NCDOT.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 125 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
$>\quad$ Extend the existing southbound left-turn lane on NC 39 to provide a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 12 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix K for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

TABLE 12: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 39 + OLD US 264

| Conditions | AP$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{WB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & C(16) \\ & C(21) \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & F(76) \\ & D(32) \\ & A(8) \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1}, 1 \mathrm{TH}, \frac{1 \mathrm{RT}}{} \\ & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1 \mathrm{LT}} 1 \mathrm{TH}, \underline{1 \mathrm{RT}} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{RT} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(38) \\ & D(38) \\ & C(29) \\ & C(25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(43) \\ & D(40) \\ & C(32) \\ & C(29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ |
| Build (2027) | EB <br> WB <br> NB <br> SB | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1 \mathrm{l}} 1 \mathrm{TH}, \frac{1 \mathrm{RT}}{1 \mathrm{LT}} 1 \mathrm{TH}, \frac{1 \mathrm{RT}}{} \\ & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(39) \\ & D(40) \\ & C(30) \\ & C(25) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(46) \\ & D(46) \\ & C(33) \\ & C(30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & (35) \end{aligned}$ |

[^2]Capacity analysis of Existing (2022) conditions indicate that the intersection of NC 39 and Old US 264 currently operates at LOS A for the major-street left-turn movement and at LOS D or better for the minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hour, with the exception of the eastbound approach (LOS F) during the PM peak hour.

Under future 2027 conditions, the Sidney Creek adjacent development is expected to install a traffic signal in addition to constructing geometric improvements at this intersection. Capacity analysis of No-Build (2027) and Build (2027) conditions indicates that this intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS C during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Additionally, all approaches are expected to operate at LOS D or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

The proposed development is expected to account for less than $7 \%$ of the total trips at the intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Build (2027) conditions. It should also be noted that the subject intersection is approximately 3 miles from the proposed site's property line. Due to the expected acceptable operation of this intersection upon buildout of the proposed development, no improvements are recommended by the development.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1

The future intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1 is expected to operate as an unsignalized, three-leg, right turn in/right turn out intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions.

Table 13 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix L for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 13: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | AP$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W^{1} \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | 1 RT <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 TH | A (9) -- -- | N/A | A (9) | N/A |

Improvements recommended by the Developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicates that the intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1 is expected to operate at LOS A for the minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

An exclusive northbound right-turn lane was considered at this intersection based on the methodology outlined in the Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways (published by the NCDOT). Based on the findings from the turn lane warrant analysis, the intersection does not meet the criteria to warrant an exclusive turn lane. Additionally, Chamblee Road is expected to have an AADT of less than 4,000 vpd upon buildout year 2027, which is the typical threshold for considering designated turn lanes at unsignalized intersections; therefore, no exclusive turn lanes are recommended at the site drive. Appendix P provides the Turn Lane Warrant analysis.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2

The future intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2 is expected to operate as an unsignalized, four-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions.

Table 14 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix $M$ for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 14: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and <br> Approach <br> Delay <br> (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and <br> Approach <br> Delay <br> (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathbf{W B}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & \text { A (10) } \\ & \text { A (7) } \\ & \text { A (7) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(10) \\ & \mathrm{B}(10) \\ & \mathrm{A}(8) \\ & \mathrm{A}(7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

Improvements recommended by the Developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicates that the intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2 is expected to operate at LOS B or better for the major-street left-turn movements and minor-street approaches during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

An exclusive northbound right-turn lane was considered at this intersection based on the methodology outlined in the Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways (published by the NCDOT). Based on the findings from the turn lane warrant analysis, the intersection does not meet the criteria to warrant an exclusive turn lane. Additionally, Chamblee Road is expected to have an AADT of less than 4,000 vpd upon buildout year 2027, which is the typical threshold for considering designated turn lanes at unsignalized intersections; therefore, no exclusive turn lanes are recommended at the site drive. Appendix P provides the Turn Lane Warrant analysis.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3

The future intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3 is expected to operate as an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions.

Table 15 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to Appendix N for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 15: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & E B B^{2} \\ & N B^{1} \\ & S B \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | A (9) <br> A (7) <br> -- | N/A | A (9) <br> A (8) <br> -- | N/A |

Improvements recommended by the Developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicates that the intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3 is expected to operate at LOS A for the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

An exclusive northbound right-turn lane was considered at this intersection based on the methodology outlined in the Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways (published by the NCDOT). Based on the findings from the turn lane warrant analysis, the intersection does not meet the criteria to warrant an exclusive turn lane. Additionally, Chamblee Road is expected to have an AADT of less than 4,000 vpd upon buildout year 2027, which is the typical threshold for considering designated turn lanes at unsignalized intersections; therefore, no exclusive turn lanes are recommended at the site drive. Appendix P provides the Turn Lane Warrant analysis.

## CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this Traffic Impact Analysis is to determine the potential traffic impacts of this development and to identify transportation improvements that may be required to mitigate the impacts on the roadway network. The proposed residential development will be located along Chamblee Road, north of Perry Curtis Road in Zebulon, NC. Site access will be served via one (1) right-in/right-out driveway and two (2) full movement driveways on Chamblee Road as well as via a connection to the existing Ridge Valley Way which is stubbed to the southern border of the property. The site is currently undeveloped and is expected to consist of a maximum of 211 single family homes and 199 townhomes and is expected to be built-out by the year 2027.

Based on the approved scoping, the following intersections were included in this TIA study area:
> Chamblee Road/ E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road
> NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road
> Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court
> Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way
> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road
> NC 39 and Wake County Line Road
> NC 39 and Old US 264
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2
> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3
Capacity analysis was conducted at all study intersections according to NCDOT and Town guidelines utilizing the methodology contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Highway Capacity Manual. Based on review of adjacent development and background information provided by NCDOT and the Town, the following improvements have been identified or are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. Figure 11 provides a graphical representation of recommended improvements at the study intersections.

## Improvements by Sidney Creek

## NC 39 and Old US 264

> M onitor for signalization and install once warranted and approved by NCDOT.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 125 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Extend the existing southbound left-turn lane on NC 39 to provide a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1
> Construct Site Drive \#1 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.

- Note: This intersection will be restricted to right-in/right-out operations.
> Provide stop control on the westbound approach of the site drive.

Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2
> Construct Site Drive \#2 with a full movement eastbound and westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane each, respectively.
> Provide stop control on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the site drives.
Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3
> Construct Site Drive \#3 as a full movement eastbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
> Provide stop control on the eastbound approach of the site drive.


## APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

October 12, 2022
M ichael J. Clark, AICP, CZO
Town of Zebulon
1003 North Arendell Avenue
Zebulon, NC 27597
919.823.1808

RE: Chamblee Property - Zebulon, NC - Traffic Impact Analysis

Dear M r. Clark,

## MEMORANDUM OFUNDERSTANDING

This letter provides a M emorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the proposed scope and assumptions related to the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Chamblee Property development, to be located along Chamblee Road, north of Perry Curtis Road in Zebulon, North Carolina. A preliminary site plan is attached. The following TIA scope is based on preliminary scoping email coordination with the Town of Zebulon (Town) and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and a scoping meeting held on 9/27/2022 with Town and NCDOT staff.

The proposed development is anticipated to be completed in 2027 and is expected to include the following uses:
> 211 Single family homes
> 119 townhomes

The proposed development is expected to be served by one (1) right-in/right-out driveway on Chamblee Road, three (3) full movement driveways on Chamblee Road (two on the western side of Chamblee Road and one on the eastern side) and connection to the existing Ridge Valley Way stubbed to the properties southern border.

## STUDY AREA

Based on coordination with NCDOT and Town staff, the study area consists of the following intersections:
> Temple-Johnson Road at NC 96
> Perry Curtis Road at NC 96
> Chamblee Road at Temple-Johnson Road
> Perry Curtis Road at Perry Ridge Court
> Perry Ridge Court at Ridge Valley Way
> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road at Chamblee Road
> Wake County Line Road at NC 39
> NC 39 at Old US 264

## M EM ORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING >CHAMBLEEPROPERTY

## EXSTINGTRATCVOLUMES

Peak hour turning movement counts will be conducted during weekday AM (7:00 to 9:00 AM ) and weekday PM (4:00 to 6:00 PM ) peak hours in June and October 2022 at the existing study intersections while local public schools are in session. The existing volumes at the intersection of Perry Ridge Court at Ridge Valley Way will be pulled through from the adjacent intersection of Perry Curtis Road at Perry Ridge Court.

Traffic volumes will be balanced between study intersections, where appropriate.

## NO-BUILDTRATFCVOLUMES

No-Build (2027) traffic volumes are proposed to be determined by projecting existing (2022) traffic volumes to the buildout year (2027) using a 3\% annually compounded growth rate, as determined based on coordination with the Town.

Based on coordination with the Town and NCDOT, the Sidney Creek Residential development will be included as an adjacent development according to the 2019 Traffic Impact Analysis

## TRIPGENERATION

Based on the Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, and the suggested method of trip calculations provided in NCDOT's Rate vs. Equation spreadsheet, trips for the proposed development were calculated for weekday daily, weekday AM peak hour, and weekday PM peak hour. Refer to Table 1 for the trip generation for the proposed development.

| TABLE 1: TRIPGENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use (IIE Code) | Density | Calculation Methodology | Daily <br> Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (210) | 211 units | Adjacent / Equation | 2,006 | 38 | 109 | 147 | 126 | 74 | 200 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (215) | 119 units | Adjacent / Equation | 856 | 17 | 39 | 56 | 38 | 29 | 67 |
|  |  | Total Trips | 2,862 | 55 | 148 | 203 | 164 | 103 | 26 |

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION/ ASSGNMENT

The primary site trip distribution was determined based on the locations of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment. A summary of the regional residential distributions is below:
$>40 \%$ to/from the north via NC 96
$>40 \%$ to/from the north via NC 39
$>15 \%$ to/from the north via Chamblee Road
$>5 \%$ to/from the south via NC 96

To account for the traffic of the proposed development, the trip generation will be applied to the trip distribution and added to the no-build traffic volumes to determine build conditions. Refer to the attached figure for the trip distributions at the study intersections.

## ANALYSSSSCEARIOS

Study intersections will be analyzed during the weekday AM and PM peak hours under the following traffic scenarios:
$>$ Existing (2022) Conditions
> No-Build (2027) Conditions
> Build (2027) Conditions

## STUDY DOCUMENT

All capacity analysis will be performed utilizing Synchro (Version 11.1). The traffic study report will be prepared based on Town and NCDOT requirements and will be summarized in a letter format.

If you find this memorandum of understanding acceptable, please let me know so that we may include it in the attachments. If you should have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at 919.287.0741.

Sincerely,
MCADAM


Nate Bouquin, PE, PTOE
Traffic Engineering Lead, Transportation

## Attachments: Preliminary Site Plan

 Site Trip Distribution FigureCC: Jeremy Warren, NCDOT<br>Matthew Nolfo, NCDOT<br>Clarence Bunting, NCDOT<br>Aaron Chalker, Town of Zebulon




Thanks!

凹
Nate Bouquin PE PTOE
traffic engineering lead, transportation
McADAMS
direct 919.287.0741 mobile 919.961.4065
bouquin@mcadamsco.com
621 Hillsborough Street, Suite 500, Raleigh, NC 27603
www.mcadamsco.com
Join Our Team
ii) 9 아
*Our Raleigh office has moved! We can't wait to see you there soon.
From: W arren, Jeremy L [ilwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:ilwarren@ncdot.gov)
Sent: M onday, October 17, 2022 3:02 PM
To: Nate Bouquin [bouquin@mcadamsco.com](mailto:bouquin@mcadamsco.com); Aaron Chalker [achalker@townofzebulon.org](mailto:achalker@townofzebulon.org); Michael Clark [mclark@townofzebulon.org](mailto:mclark@townofzebulon.org); Nolfo, Matthew J <mjnolfo@ ncdot.gov>
Cc: Bunting, Clarence B[cbunting@ncdot.gov](mailto:cbunting@ncdot.gov); Lineberger, Nicholas C[nclineberger@ncdot.gov](mailto:nclineberger@ncdot.gov); Tyler Huggins [huggins@mcadamsco.com](mailto:huggins@mcadamsco.com)
Subject: RE: [External] Chamblee Rd Residential - TIA Scoping

CAUTION: This email is NOT from McAdams. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and content.
The Department has no comments for the M OU.
Jeremy Warren, P.E.
District Engineer
Division 5, District 1
North Carolina Department of Transportation
9198146115 office NEW
ilwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607


Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the
North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
From: Nate Bouquin [bouquin@mcadamsco.com](mailto:bouquin@mcadamsco.com)
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 3:13 PM
To: Aaron Chalker [achalker@townofzebulon.org](mailto:achalker@townofzebulon.org); Michael Clark [mclark@townofzebulon.org](mailto:mclark@townofzebulon.org); Warren, Jeremy L <lwarren@ ncdot.gov>; Nolfo, M atthew J [minolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:minolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Bunting, Clarence B<cbunting@ ncdot.gov>; Lineberger, Nicholas C [nclineberger@ncdot.gov](mailto:nclineberger@ncdot.gov); Tyler Huggins [huggins@mcadamsco.com](mailto:huggins@mcadamsco.com)
Subject: RE: [External] Chamblee Rd Residential - TIA Scoping

Tyler Huggins

## From:

Michael Clark [mclark@townofzebulon.org](mailto:mclark@townofzebulon.org)
Sent:
Monday, October 24, 2022 3:51 PM
To:
Nate Bouquin; Aaron Chalker
Cc:
Tyler Huggins
Subject:

RE: [External] Chamblee Rd Residential - TIA Scoping

You don't often get email from mclark@townofzebulon.org. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email is NOT from M cAdams. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and content. Good Afternoon,

The Town is good with these assumptions.
Thank you,
Mike
Michael J. Clark, AICP, CZO
Planning Director
Town of Zebulon
(919) 823-1808 (direct)

1003 North Arendell Avenue
Zebulon, N.C. 27597

## ZEBULON

NORTH CABOLINA
www.townofzebulon.org
Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Nate Bouquin [bouquin@mcadamsco.com](mailto:bouquin@mcadamsco.com)
Sent: M onday, October 24, 2022 9:42 AM
To: Aaron Chalker [achalker@townofzebulon.org](mailto:achalker@townofzebulon.org); M ichael Clark [mclark@townofzebulon.org](mailto:mclark@townofzebulon.org)
Cc: Tyler Huggins <huggins@ mcadamsco.com>
Subject: RE: [External] Chamblee Rd Residential - TIA Scoping
CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Michael / Aaron,
Does the Town have any additional comments on this M OU or are we clear to proceed with these assumptions?

## APPENDIX B: COUNT DATA



Peak-Hour: 7:15 AM -- 8:15 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | Perry Ridge Ct (Northbound) |  |  |  | Perry Ridge Ct (Southbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 11 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 27 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 70 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 76 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 74 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 58 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 62 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 |  | 08 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  | 4 |
| Pedestrians |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:

Peak-Hour: 4:45 PM -- 5:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 4:45 PM -- 5:00 PM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | Perry Ridge Ct (Northbound) |  |  |  | Perry Ridge Ct (Southbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 26 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 17 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 96 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 94 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 101 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 113 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 113 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

Comments:



Peak-Hour: 7:00 AM -- 8:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | S Arendell Ave (Northbound) |  |  |  | S Arendell Ave (Southbound) |  |  |  | Temple-Johnson Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Temple-Johnson Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 64 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 101 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 108 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 91 | 394 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 83 | 383 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 350 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 90 | 332 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 340 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 328 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  | 32 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 44 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:


Peak-Hour: 7:15 AM -- 8:15 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | Chamblee Rd (Northbound) |  |  |  | Chamblee Rd (Southbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 9 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 13 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 28 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 63 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 73 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 73 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 57 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 65 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 20 | 0 |  | 12 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |  | 2 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:


Peak-Hour: 4:45 PM -- 5:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:15 PM -- 5:30 PM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | Chamblee Rd (Northbound) |  |  |  | Chamblee Rd (Southbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Perry Curtis Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 21 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 21 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 23 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 92 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 97 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 31 | 107 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 30 | 114 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 24 | 111 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 16 | 0 |  | 24 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:


SOURCE: Quality Counts, LLC (http://www.qualitycounts.net) 1-877-580-2212




Peak-Hour: 4:00 PM -- 5:00 PM
Peak 15-Min: 4:45 PM -- 5:00 PM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | Chamblee Rd (Northbound) |  |  |  | Chamblee Rd (Southbound) |  |  |  | Temple-Johnson Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Temple-Johnson Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 57 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 51 |
| 5:15 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 52 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 51 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 39 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 76 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 8 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |


Peak-Hour: 7:00 AM -- 8:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:30 AM -- 7:45 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | NC 39(Northbound) |  |  |  | NC 39(Southbound) |  |  |  | Wake County Line Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Wake County Line Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 9 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 6 | 94 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 10 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 6 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 544 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 514 |
| 8:15 AM | 8 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 487 |
| 8:30 AM | 8 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 436 |
| 8:45 AM | 5 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 390 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 40 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 12 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 6 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:
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## 6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric and traffic control improvements have been identified at study intersections. The improvements are summarized below and are illustrated in Figure E-1.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Based on previous coordination with the Town consultant, offsite improvements should be considered for a cost-share agreement (proportional share fee-in-lieu) with the Town.

## NC 39 and US 264 Westbound Ramps

- Monitor the intersection for signalization and conduct a signal warrant analysis prior to the build-out of the proposed Sidney Creek development.


## NC 39 and Old US 264

- Utilizing the existing pavement width, provide an exclusive westbound left-turn lane with maximized (approximately 50 feet) storage and appropriate taper and an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with maximized (approximately 125 feet) storage and appropriate taper and deceleration length.
- Utilizing the existing pavement width, provide an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane with maximized (approximately 50 feet) storage and appropriate taper and an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane with maximized (approximately 100 feet) storage and appropriate taper and deceleration length.
- Monitor the intersection for signalization and conduct a signal warrant analysis prior to the build-out of the proposed Sidney Creek development.
- Extend the existing southbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 100 feet of storage and appropriate taper and deceleration length.


## Chamblee Road and Site Drive 1

- Construct the westbound approach (Site Drive 1) with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the westbound approach.

NC 39 and Site Drive 2

- Construct the eastbound approach (Site Drive 2) with one ingress lane and two egress lanes.
- Provide stop-control for the eastbound approach.
- Provide an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate taper and deceleration length.
- Provide an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate taper and deceleration length.


| O RAMEY KEMP | Sidney Creek Zebulon, NC | Site Location Map |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| isportation enginer |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 1 |



# APPENDIX D: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS CHAMBLEE ROAD/E. HORTON STREET + TEMPLEJOHNSON ROAD 




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 28 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 28 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 11 | 4 | 12 | 31 | 4 |



1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | - | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 36 | 17 | 22 | 47 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 36 | 17 | 22 | 47 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 40 | 19 | 24 | 52 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | ajor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 116 | 54 | 56 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 54 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 62 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 880 | 1013 | 1549 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 969 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 961 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 869 | 1013 | 1549 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 869 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 957 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 961 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 8.8 |  | 3.2 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT EBLn1 |  | SBT | SBR |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1549 | - | 996 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.012 | - | 0.045 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.4 | 0 | 8.8 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | 0.1 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



## APPENDIX E: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 96 + TEMPLE-JOHNSON ROAD

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 285 | 4 | 4 | 104 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 285 | 4 | 4 | 104 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 4 | 317 | 4 | 4 | 116 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 443 | 319 | 0 | 0 | 321 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 319 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 124 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 572 | 722 | - | - | 1239 | - |
| Stage 1 | 737 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 902 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 570 | 722 | - | - | 1239 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 570 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 737 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 899 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.7 |  | 0 |  | 0.3 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 637 | 1239 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - |  | 0.014 | 0.004 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - |  | 10.7 | 7.9 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 8 | 224 | 4 | 11 | 339 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 8 | 224 | 4 | 11 | 339 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 9 | 249 | 4 | 12 | 377 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 652 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 251 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 401 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 433 | 788 | - | - | 1312 | - |
| Stage 1 | 791 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 676 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 428 | 788 | - | - | 1312 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 428 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 791 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 668 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11 |  | 0 |  | 0.2 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 615 | 1312 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - |  | 0.022 | 0.009 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11 | 7.8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 25 | 370 | 4 | 8 | 134 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 25 | 370 | 4 | 8 | 134 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 28 | 411 | 4 | 9 | 149 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 580 | 413 | 0 | 0 | 415 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 413 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 167 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 477 | 639 | - | - | 1144 | - |
| Stage 1 | 668 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 863 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 473 | 639 | - | - | 1144 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 473 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 668 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 855 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.2 |  | 0 |  | 0.5 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 609 | 1144 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.053 | 0.008 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.2 | 8.2 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.2 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 23 | 286 | 4 | 37 | 437 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 23 | 286 | 4 | 37 | 437 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 26 | 318 | 4 | 41 | 486 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 888 | 320 | 0 | 0 | 322 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 320 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 568 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - |  | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 314 | 721 | - | - | 1238 | - |
| Stage 1 | 736 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 567 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 300 | 721 | - | - | 1238 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 300 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 736 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 541 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.3 |  | 0 |  | 0.6 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 597 | 1238 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.05 | 0.033 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.3 | 8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.2 | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 62 | 393 | 4 | 22 | 142 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 62 | 393 | 4 | 22 | 142 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 69 | 437 | 4 | 24 | 158 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 645 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 441 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 439 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 206 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 437 | 618 | - | - | 1119 | - |
| Stage 1 | 650 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 829 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 427 | 618 | - | - | 1119 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 427 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 650 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 809 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.8 |  | 0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 602 | 1119 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.122 | 0.022 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.8 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.4 | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 50 | 302 | 4 | 78 | 462 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 50 | 302 | 4 | 78 | 462 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 56 | 336 | 4 | 87 | 513 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1025 | 338 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 338 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 687 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 260 | 704 | - | - | 1219 | - |
| Stage 1 | 722 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 499 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 234 | 704 | - | - | 1219 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 234 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 722 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 449 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.5 |  | 0 |  | 1.2 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 613 | 1219 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.098 | 0.071 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.5 | 8.2 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0.2 | - |

## APPENDIX F: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 96 + PERRY CURTIS ROAD

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 72 | 214 | 4 | 11 | 93 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 72 | 214 | 4 | 11 | 93 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 80 | 238 | 4 | 12 | 103 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 367 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 242 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 240 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 127 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 633 | 799 | - | - | 1324 | - |
| Stage 1 | 800 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 899 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 627 | 799 | - | - | 1324 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 627 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 800 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 890 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.1 |  | 0 |  | 0.8 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 788 | 1324 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.107 | 0.009 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 10.1 | 7.7 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.4 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 54 | 171 | 6 | 89 | 252 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 54 | 171 | 6 | 89 | 252 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 60 | 190 | 7 | 99 | 280 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 672 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 197 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 194 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 478 | - | - | - | - |

HCM LOS ..... B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -769 | 1376 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.085 | 0.072 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 10.1 | 7.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| A |  | - |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 123 | 248 | 6 | 26 | 108 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 123 | 248 | 6 | 26 | 108 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 137 | 276 | 7 | 29 | 120 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 458 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 283 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 280 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 178 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 561 | 759 | - | - | 1279 | - |
| Stage 1 | 767 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 853 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 548 | 759 | - | - | 1279 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 548 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 767 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 833 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.3 |  | 0 |  | 1.5 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 727 | 1279 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.212 | 0.023 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.3 | 7.9 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.8 | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\mathbf{r}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 23 | 146 | 248 | 9 | 34 | 108 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 23 | 146 | 248 | 9 | 34 | 108 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 26 | 162 | 276 | 10 | 38 | 120 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 477 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 281 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 196 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 547 | 758 | - | - | 1276 | - |
| Stage 1 | 767 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 837 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 529 | 758 | - | - | 1276 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 529 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 767 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 810 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.8 |  | 0 |  | 1.9 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 716 | 1276 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.262 | 0.03 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.8 | 7.9 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.1 | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



## APPENDIX G: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Tr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 5 | 39 | 4 | 5 | 64 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 5 | 39 | 4 | 5 | 64 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 6 | 43 | 4 | 6 | 71 |



4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 120 | 4 | 4 | 33 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 120 | 4 | 4 | 33 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 4 | 133 | 4 | 4 | 37 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 180 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 135 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 810 | 914 | - | - | 1447 | - |
| Stage 1 | 891 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 977 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 808 | 914 | - | - | 1447 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 808 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 891 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 974 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.2 |  | 0 |  | 0.8 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 858 | 1447 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.01 | 0.003 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.2 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 6 | 80 | 4 | 6 | 133 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 6 | 80 | 4 | 6 | 133 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 7 | 89 | 4 | 7 | 148 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 198 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 135 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 63 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 791 | 914 | - | - | 1447 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 891 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 960 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 784 | 914 | - | - | 1447 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 784 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 891 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 951 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.3 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBT | NBR | BLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 885 | 1447 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.05 | 0.009 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.3 | 7.5 | 0 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.2 | 0 | - |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 27 | 80 | 8 | 39 | 133 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 27 | 80 | 8 | 39 | 133 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 30 | 89 | 9 | 43 | 148 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 328 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 94 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 234 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 666 | 963 | - | - | 1495 | - |
| Stage 1 | 930 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 805 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 645 | 963 | - | - | 1495 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 645 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 930 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 780 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.2 |  | 0 |  | 1.7 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 894 | 1495 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.04 | 0.029 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.2 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |

# APPENDIX H: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY 



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 8 | 0 | - | 0 | 18 | 6 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 6 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | -3.518 | 3.318 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1612 | - | - | -1000 | 1077 |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 1017 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | -1011 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1612 | - | - | - | 998 | 1077 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 998 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | -1015 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | -1011 | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.6 | 0 | 8.5 |

HCM LOS A

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1612 | - | - | -1036 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.009 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.2 | 0 | - | -8.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |



5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way


| Major2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Flow All | 8 | 0 | - | 0 | 18 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 12 |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.6 | 0 | 8.5 |

HCM LOS A

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1612 | - | - | -1036 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.009 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.2 | 0 | - | -8.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |
| H | 0 |  |  |  |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Intersection |  | EBT | WBT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3.5 | 3.5 |  |  | WBR | SBL SBR |  |
| Movement | EBL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 11 | 0 | - | 0 | 24 | 9 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 9 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 15 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | -3.518 | 3.318 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1608 | - | - | - | 992 | 1073 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 1014 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | -1008 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1608 | - | - | - | 990 | 1073 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 990 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | -1012 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | -1008 | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.9 | 0 | 8.5 |

HCM LOS A

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1608 | - | - | -1030 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.009 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.2 | 0 | - | -8.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| HCM A5th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |




|  |  | Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 41 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 26 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 41 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 26 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 46 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 29 |



# APPENDIX I: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - PERRY CURTIS ROAD/WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD 

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 16 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 16 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, $\%$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 18 | 31 | 10 | 7 | 4 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 36 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 36 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 26 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1568 | - | - - | - | 944 | 1037 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 986 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 997 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1568 | - | - - | - | 941 | 1037 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 941 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 983 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 997 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1.5 |  | 0 |  | 8.7 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1568 |  | - | - | 977 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.003 | - | - | - | 0.011 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.3 | 0 | - | - | 8.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 51 | 26 | 12 | 15 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 51 | 26 | 12 | 15 | 5 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, $\%$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 57 | 29 | 13 | 17 | 6 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 42 | 0 | - | 0 | 101 | 36 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 36 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 65 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1567 | - | - - | - | 898 | 1037 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 986 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 958 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1567 | - | - - | - | 895 | 1037 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 895 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 983 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 958 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | S 0.5 |  | 0 |  | 9 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1567 | + | - |  | 927 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.003 | - | - | - | 0.024 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.3 | 0 | - | - | 9 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | - | 0.1 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 22 | 19 | 32 | 16 | 25 | 54 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 22 | 19 | 32 | 16 | 25 | 54 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 24 | 21 | 36 | 18 | 28 | 60 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 54 | 0 | - | 0 | 114 | 45 |
| Stage 1 | - |  | - | - | 45 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 69 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1551 | - | - | - | 882 | 1025 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 977 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 954 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1551 | - | - | - | 868 | 1025 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 868 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 961 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 954 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.9 |  | 0 |  | 9.1 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1551 | - | - | - | 970 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.016 | - | - | - | 0.09 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.4 | 0 | - | - | 9.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 |  | - |  | 0.3 |


|  |  | Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 4 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 64 | 59 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 41 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 64 | 59 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 41 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None |  | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 66 | 33 | 37 | 31 | 46 |



|  |  | Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 5 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 22 | 26 | 35 | 35 | 77 | 54 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 22 | 26 | 35 | 35 | 77 | 54 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None |  | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 24 | 29 | 39 | 39 | 86 | 60 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 78 | 0 | - | 0 | 136 | 59 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 59 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 77 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1520 | - | - | - | 857 | 1007 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 964 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 946 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1520 | - | - | - | 843 | 1007 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 843 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 949 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 946 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | S 3.4 |  | 0 |  | 9.7 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1520 | - | - |  | 904 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.016 | - | - | - | 0.161 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.4 | 0 | - | - | 9.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | - | 0.6 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 64 | 64 | 38 | 90 | 63 | 41 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 64 | 64 | 38 | 90 | 63 | 41 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 71 | 42 | 100 | 70 | 46 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 142 | 0 | - | 0 | 305 | 92 |
| Stage 1 | - |  | - | - | 92 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 213 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1441 | - | - | - | 687 | 965 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 932 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 823 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1441 | - | - | - | 652 | 965 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 652 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 884 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 823 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.8 |  | 0 |  | 10.7 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1441 | - | - | - | 748 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.049 | - | - | - | 0.154 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.6 | 0 | - | - | 10.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | - | 0.5 |

## APPENDIX J: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 39 + WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | -1 | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 8 | 32 | 363 | 123 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 8 | 32 | 363 | 123 | 6 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 9 | 36 | 403 | 137 | 7 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 14 | 27 | 43 | 427 | 161 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 14 | 27 | 43 | 427 | 161 | 7 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 30 | 48 | 474 | 179 | 8 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 753 | 183 | 187 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 183 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 570 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 377 | 859 | 1387 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 848 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 566 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 359 | 859 | 1387 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 359 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 808 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 566 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.7 |  | 0.7 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT | BLn1 | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1387 | - | 582 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.034 | - | 0.078 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.7 | 0 | 11.7 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 |  | 0.3 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | -1 | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 23 | 57 | 50 | 331 | 369 | 19 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 23 | 57 | 50 | 331 | 369 | 19 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 26 | 63 | 56 | 368 | 410 | 21 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 901 | 421 | 431 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 421 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 480 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 309 | 632 | 1129 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 662 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 622 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 290 | 632 | 1129 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 290 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 621 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 622 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.4 |  | 1.1 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT | BLn1 | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1129 | - | 472 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.049 | - | 0.188 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.4 | 0 | 14.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 73 | 27 | 43 | 427 | 161 | 29 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 73 | 27 | 43 | 427 | 161 | 29 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 81 | 30 | 48 | 474 | 179 | 32 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 63 | 57 | 50 | 331 | 369 | 84 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 63 | 57 | 50 | 331 | 369 | 84 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 70 | 63 | 56 | 368 | 410 | 93 |



# APPENDIX K: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - NC 39 + OLD US 264 




| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1440 | - | - | 393 | 482 | 1216 | - |




|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | ( | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{4}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 87 | 172 | 56 | 535 | 35 | 94 | 203 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 87 | 172 | 56 | 535 | 35 | 94 | 203 | 10 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 100 |  | 0 | 50 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.991 |  |  | 0.993 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1846 | 0 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1846 | 0 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1272 |  |  | 1346 |  |  | 8116 |  |  | 1238 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 15.8 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 100.6 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 6 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 97 | 191 | 62 | 594 | 39 | 104 | 226 | 11 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 6 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 97 | 191 | 62 | 633 | 0 | 104 | 237 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 |  | 20 | 100 |  |
| Trailing Detector (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  | 20 | 6 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{\square}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 122 | 99 | 29 | 74 | 109 | 65 | 315 | 29 | 187 | 551 | 19 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 122 | 99 | 29 | 74 | 109 | 65 | 315 | 29 | 187 | 551 | 19 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.987 |  |  | 0.995 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1839 | 0 | 1770 | 1853 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1839 | 0 | 1770 | 1853 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Link Distance (t) |  | 1272 |  |  | 1346 |  |  | 8116 |  |  | 1238 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 15.8 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 100.6 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 27 | 136 | 110 | 32 | 82 | 121 | 72 | 350 | 32 | 208 | 612 | 21 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 27 | 136 | 110 | 32 | 82 | 121 | 72 | 382 | 0 | 208 | 633 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(t) |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | O |  |
| Crosswalk Width(t) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (tt) | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 |  | 20 | 100 |  |
| Trailing Detector ( t ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(tt) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(tt) | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  | 20 | 6 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(tt) |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(tt) |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 15.0 | 53.0 |  | 30.0 | 68.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.7\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 11.7\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 12.5\% | 44.2\% |  | 25.0\% | 56.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 7.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 46.0 |  | 23.0 | 61.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 9.9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 9.9 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 10.5 | 29.0 |  | 17.7 | 41.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.12 | 0.34 |  | 0.21 | 0.49 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.60 |  | 0.56 | 0.70 |  |
| Control Delay | 46.0 | 42.4 | 43.3 | 46.1 | 36.5 | 39.7 | 47.3 | 29.5 |  | 40.5 | 25.0 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 46.0 | 42.4 | 43.3 | 46.1 | 36.5 | 39.7 | 47.3 | 29.5 |  | 40.5 | 25.0 |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 43.1 |  |  | 39.5 |  |  | 32.3 |  |  | 28.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 15 | 74 | 60 | 18 | 35 | 53 | 40 | 185 |  | 112 | 315 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 49 | 156 | 132 | 55 | 101 | 144 | 100 | 321 |  | 215 | 476 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 1192 |  |  | 1266 |  |  | 8036 |  |  | 1158 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 207 | 437 | 372 | 207 | 478 | 406 | 231 | 1152 |  | 577 | 1426 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.31 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.33 |  | 0.36 | 0.44 |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 84.3
Natural Cycle: 75
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70
Intersection Signal Delay: 33.2
Intersection Capacity Utilization 64.9\%
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: $\quad$ 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | ( | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{4}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 87 | 172 | 56 | 594 | 35 | 94 | 225 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 87 | 172 | 56 | 594 | 35 | 94 | 225 | 10 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1272 |  |  | 1346 |  |  | 8116 |  |  | 1238 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 15.8 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 100.6 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 6 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 97 | 191 | 62 | 660 | 39 | 104 | 250 | 11 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 6 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 97 | 191 | 62 | 699 | 0 | 104 | 261 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 |  | 20 | 100 |  |
| Trailing Detector (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  | 20 | 6 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 14.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 14.0 | 61.0 |  | 17.0 | 64.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.7\% | 23.3\% | 23.3\% | 11.7\% | 23.3\% | 23.3\% | 11.7\% | 50.8\% |  | 14.2\% | 53.3\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 54.0 |  | 10.0 | 57.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.0 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 10.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 10.0 | 41.6 |  | 12.0 | 43.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.48 |  | 0.14 | 0.51 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.55 | 0.30 | 0.78 |  | 0.42 | 0.28 |  |
| Control Delay | 46.8 | 37.8 | 38.3 | 46.8 | 35.4 | 41.8 | 49.0 | 28.5 |  | 48.3 | 15.1 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 46.8 | 37.8 | 38.3 | 46.8 | 35.4 | 41.8 | 49.0 | 28.5 |  | 48.3 | 15.1 |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C |  | D | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 38.8 |  |  | 40.1 |  |  | 30.2 |  |  | 24.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 3 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 44 | 94 | 32 | 310 |  | 53 | 78 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 18 | 51 | 54 | 38 | 116 | 219 | 94 | 624 |  | 138 | 174 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 1192 |  |  | 1266 |  |  | 8036 |  |  | 1158 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 206 | 554 | 470 | 206 | 561 | 476 | 206 | 1256 |  | 274 | 1306 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | , | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.40 | 0.30 | 0.56 |  | 0.38 | 0.20 |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 86.1
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.78
Intersection Signal Delay: 31.2
Intersection Capacity Utilization 62.4\%
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 4 | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 122 | 99 | 29 | 74 | 109 | 65 | 355 | 29 | 187 | 616 | 19 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 122 | 99 | 29 | 74 | 109 | 65 | 355 | 29 | 187 | 616 | 19 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (t) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( t ) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Fit |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.996 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1842 | 0 | 1770 | 1855 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1842 | 0 | 1770 | 1855 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Link Distance (t) |  | 1272 |  |  | 1346 |  |  | 8116 |  |  | 1238 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 15.8 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 100.6 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 27 | 136 | 110 | 32 | 82 | 121 | 72 | 394 | 32 | 208 | 684 | 21 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 27 | 136 | 110 | 32 | 82 | 121 | 72 | 426 | 0 | 208 | 705 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(t) |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(t) |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | , | 15 |  | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (tt) | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 |  | 20 | 100 |  |
| Trailing Detector (tt) | 0 | 0 | , | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(tt) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(tt) | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  | 20 | 6 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(tt) |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(tt) |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 15.0 | 53.0 |  | 30.0 | 68.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.7\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 11.7\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 12.5\% | 44.2\% |  | 25.0\% | 56.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 7.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 46.0 |  | 23.0 | 61.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.0 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 10.0 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 10.6 | 32.9 |  | 18.3 | 45.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.37 |  | 0.20 | 0.51 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.14 | 0.45 | 0.43 | 0.16 | 0.27 | 0.47 | 0.34 | 0.63 |  | 0.57 | 0.75 |  |
| Control Delay | 49.2 | 45.6 | 46.5 | 49.4 | 42.5 | 47.6 | 51.0 | 29.6 |  | 43.7 | 26.0 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 49.2 | 45.6 | 46.5 | 49.4 | 42.5 | 47.6 | 51.0 | 29.6 |  | 43.7 | 26.0 |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 46.3 |  |  | 46.1 |  |  | 32.7 |  |  | 30.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 16 | 80 | 64 | 19 | 47 | 71 | 43 | 218 |  | 121 | 378 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 51 | 164 | 139 | 57 | 107 | 151 | 104 | 361 |  | 227 | 556 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1192 |  |  | 1266 |  |  | 8036 |  |  | 1158 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 197 | 416 | 354 | 197 | 416 | 354 | 219 | 1098 |  | 549 | 1364 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.14 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.39 |  | 0.38 | 0.52 |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 89.3
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.75
Intersection Signal Delay: 35.0
Intersection Capacity Utilization 68.3\%
Intersection LOS: D
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: $\quad$ 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264


McAdams

# APPENDIX L: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1 

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 9 | 92 | 4 | 0 | 41 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 9 | 92 | 4 | 0 | 41 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - None | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, $\%$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 10 | 102 | 4 | 0 | 46 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 104 | 0 | 0 | - |


| Conflicting Flow All | - | 104 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.22 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | -3.318 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 951 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 951 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 8.8 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS A

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -951 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.011 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -8.8 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0 |



| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 81 | 0 | 0 | - |


| Conflicting Flow All | - | 81 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.22 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | -3.318 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 979 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 979 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 8.7 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS A

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -979 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.007 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -8.7 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0 |

## APPENDIX M: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 44 | 4 | 21 | 18 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 46 | 6 | 4 | 20 | 17 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 44 | 4 | 21 | 18 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 46 | 6 | 4 | 20 | 17 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 49 | 4 | 23 | 20 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 51 | 7 | 4 | 22 | 19 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 32 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 40 | 16 | 13 | 70 | 50 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 32 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 40 | 16 | 13 | 70 | 50 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 36 | 4 | 16 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 26 | 44 | 18 | 14 | 78 | 56 |



## APPENDIX N: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\mathbf{F}^{\prime}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 13 | 5 | 56 | 58 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 13 | 5 | 56 | 58 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 14 | 6 | 62 | 64 | 4 |





## APPENDIX O: SIMTRAFFIC REPORTS

## 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.8 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.4 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 4.2 | 0.4 | 1.1 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.7 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.6 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 10.4 | 1.6 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SBR

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.5 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 6.7 |

## Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.5 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.1 |

## Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 22 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 20 |
| Link Distance (t) | 1057 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 30 | 27 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 5 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 21 | 9 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 1194 | 1680 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (tt) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 20 | 51 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 9 | 27 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 1102 | 1554 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 23 |
| Link Distance (t) | 410 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (tt) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 15 |
| Link Distance ( ft ) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 23 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 931 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | NB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 31 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 21 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 1470 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | L | L |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 55 | 64 | 10 | 17 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 12 | 36 | 0 | 9 |
| 95th Queue (tt) | 31 | 65 | 3 | 18 |
| Link Distance (t) | 1213 | 1287 |  |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (tt) |  |  | 150 | 100 |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Network wide Queuin |  |  |  |  |

## 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 6.5 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.4 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 1.8 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.0 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 1.3 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.6 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.2 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 3.9 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 13.3 | 18.5 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 17.5 | 7.1 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 0.5 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.7 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 6.6 |

## Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.6 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 8.3 |

## Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 22 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 24 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1057 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue ( (t) | 24 | 27 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 3 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 17 | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1194 | 1680 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 28 | 72 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 4 | 13 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 16 | 46 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1102 | 1554 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | :---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 30 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 10 |
| 95th Queue (tt) | 33 |
| Link Distance (t) | 410 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | :---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 31 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 10 |
| 95th Queue (tt) | 33 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue ( (tt) | 29 |
| Average Queue (tt) | 8 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 931 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (tt) | 19 | 93 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 3 | 11 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 15 | 50 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 2460 | 1470 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | L | TR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 101 | 100 | 30 | 17 | 38 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 39 | 32 | 7 | 1 | 11 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 77 | 66 | 20 | 6 | 32 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1213 | 1287 |  | 7984 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 150 |  | 100 |
| Storage Bal Dist (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.3 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 1.0 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.6 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.1 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.7 | 1.8 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/ $\operatorname{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 1.0 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 6.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 3.3 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 4.2 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 36.9 | 34.6 | 27.6 | 43.8 | 28.0 | 29.9 | 41.9 | 27.1 | 23.1 | 35.2 | 15.5 | 14.6 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 1.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 27.3 |

## Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 23.3 |

Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 26 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 23 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1057 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 26 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 13 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 32 | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1194 | 1680 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 40 | 27 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 8 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 | 26 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1102 | 1554 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 24 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 11 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 | 2304 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 33 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 21 | 60 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 27 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 7 | 46 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2550 | 931 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 18 | 55 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 8 | 33 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2460 | 1470 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| irections Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 17 | 30 | 21 | 35 | 231 | 213 | 199 | 366 | 109 | 160 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 41 | 69 | 37 | 179 | 53 | 68 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 13 | 13 | 17 | 24 | 122 | 138 | 93 | 307 | 100 | 145 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1212 |  |  | 1286 |  |  | 7981 | 1181 |  |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 100 |  | 50 |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 2 |  | 19 | 15 | 13 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 | 8 | 3 |  | 11 | 33 | 12 |

## Network Summary

## Network wide Queuing Penalty: 67

## 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.2 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.3 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.3 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 8.8 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 3.1 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.8 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 1.1 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/ $\operatorname{seh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.6 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 2.8 | 11.3 | 12.8 | 8.2 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 3.6 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 38.7 | 35.7 | 33.9 | 37.3 | 28.1 | 32.7 | 56.3 | 29.2 | 26.4 | 45.3 | 27.3 | 22.1 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied $\operatorname{Del} /$ Veh (s) | 1.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 32.4 |

## Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 28.8 |

Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road /E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 27 | 25 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 16 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 32 | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1057 | 1661 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 29 | 76 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 12 | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 31 | 43 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1194 | 1680 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 22 | 22 | 97 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 | 0 | 35 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 18 | 0 | 78 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1102 | 1141 | 1554 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 13 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 36 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 9 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 29 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 3 | 21 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 15 | 39 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2550 | 931 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 40 | 74 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 23 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 25 | 67 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2460 | 1470 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 40 | 137 | 109 | 39 | 106 | 89 | 250 | 261 | 200 | 492 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 10 | 56 | 31 | 11 | 22 | 47 | 54 | 130 | 119 | 218 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 32 | 114 | 74 | 30 | 63 | 90 | 129 | 214 | 205 | 387 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1212 |  |  | 1286 |  |  | 7981 |  | 1181 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 100 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 7 | 12 | 25 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 5 | 68 | 48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 144

## 1: Chamblee Road \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 2.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.7 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.1 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 2.3 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.1 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 1.1 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 2.3 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 1.9 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.8 | 0.1 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 4.4 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | 4.1 | 0.1 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.5 |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 34.1 | 30.8 | 28.1 | 43.8 | 26.2 | 29.6 | 43.9 | 32.1 | 30.1 | 39.8 | 13.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) |  |  | 10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 29.0 |

9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 |

10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.0 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 4.6 | 7.8 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.7 |

11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/ $\operatorname{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 3.6 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied $\operatorname{Del} /$ Veh (s) | 0.9 |
| Total $\operatorname{Del} /$ Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 25.3 |

Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 52 | 24 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 17 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 40 | 12 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1057 | 1661 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 53 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 25 | 11 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 38 | 38 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1194 | 1680 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 83 | 53 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 11 | 13 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 43 | 43 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1102 | 1554 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 53 | 24 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 25 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 47 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 | 2304 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 29 | 74 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 27 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 10 | 53 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 22 | 73 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 29 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 7 | 46 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2552 | 1499 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 38 | 72 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 8 | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 | 44 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2460 | 1470 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 35 | 30 | 45 | 56 | 224 | 208 | 250 | 534 | 117 | 130 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 31 | 69 | 41 | 205 | 64 | 61 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 13 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 106 | 145 | 113 | 348 | 115 | 111 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1212 |  |  | 1286 |  |  | 7981 | 181 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 100 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 2 |  | 17 | 4 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 2 |  | 9 | 10 | 1 |

Intersection: 9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 19 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1016 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2

| Movement | EB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 43 | 60 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 18 | 12 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 32 | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1073 | 1388 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 15 | 23 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 19 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 864 | 1499 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |
| Network wide Queuing Penalty: 28 |  |  |

1: Chamblee Road \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 10.6 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 5.2 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.2 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total DelVeh (s) | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 1.7 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/ $\operatorname{seh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 1.5 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 1.6 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 14.2 | 0.7 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 4.1 | 13.6 | 13.3 | 10.7 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | 3.7 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 43.8 | 35.6 | 38.2 | 53.3 | 35.5 | 34.6 | 49.4 | 31.7 | 20.3 | 54.7 | 32.9 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) |  | 29.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 1.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 36.5 |

9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.7 |

10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 5.5 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 |

10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.6 |

## 11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.9 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.9 |

Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied $\operatorname{Del} /$ Veh (s) | 1.0 |
| Total $\operatorname{Del} /$ Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 32.5 |

Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 25 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 23 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 40 | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1057 | 1661 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 46 | 96 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 22 | 25 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 40 | 70 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1194 | 1680 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 42 | 116 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 34 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 25 | 83 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1102 | 1554 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 77 | 26 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 19 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 52 | 13 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 | 2304 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 79 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 21 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 28 | 52 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 29 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 25 | 42 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2552 | 1499 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 60 | 162 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 14 | 34 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 42 | 98 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2460 | 1470 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 137 | 229 | 150 | 58 | 96 | 148 | 249 | 330 | 200 | 581 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 21 | 56 | 44 | 17 | 25 | 50 | 49 | 155 | 134 | 283 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 63 | 136 | 110 | 43 | 70 | 119 | 122 | 263 | 221 | 516 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1212 |  |  | 1286 |  |  | 7981 | 1181 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 100 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 |  | 9 | 17 | 30 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 |  | 6 | 109 | 56 |

Intersection: 9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 19 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 13 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1016 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 44 | 39 | 20 | 24 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 19 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 36 | 26 | 14 | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1073 | 1388 | 701 | 235 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 38 | 28 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 22 | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 864 | 1499 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 198

## APPENDIX P: TURN LANE WARRANTS



| Peak Hour | Lane | Turn Lane | Turning <br> Volume | Approach/ <br> Opposing <br> Volume | Symbol | Length <br> Warranted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday AM | NBR | Right | 1 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
| Weekday PM | NBR | Right | 3 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |

## Chamblee Property <br> Zebulon, NC



| Peak Hour | Lane | Turn Lane | Turning <br> Volume | Approach/ <br> Opposing <br> Volume | Symbol | Length <br> Warranted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday AM | NBR | Right | 6 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
| Weekday PM | NBR | Right | 16 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Weekday AM | NBL | Left | 7 | 49 | $\bigcirc$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Weekday PM | NBL | Left | 23 | 159 | $\bigcirc$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Weekday AM | SBR | Right | 17 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Weekday PM | SBR | Right | 50 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Weekday AM | SBL | Left | 4 | 87 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
| Weekday PM | SBL | Left | 13 | 79 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |

## Chamblee Property

Zebulon, NC


| Peak Hour | Lane | Turn Lane | Turning <br> Volume | Approach/ <br> Opposing <br> Volume | Symbol | Length <br> Warranted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday AM | SBR | Right | 1 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
| Weekday PM | SBR | Right | 3 | 100 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
| Weekday AM | NBL | Left | 5 | 71 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
| Weekday PM | NBL | Left | 15 | 135 | $\bigcirc$ | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |

## Chamblee Property

Zebulon, NC

## Dory Meadows Legal Description

Being all of the land described in deed book 1789, page 402 in the Durham County Register of Deeds. Being more particularly described as:

Beginning at a point on the northern right of way line of Chamblee Road (a 60 foot public right of way), being the southwest corner of Tract One as shown on book of maps 2020, page 866 in the Durham County Register of Deeds, the point of beginning; thence across the right of way of Chamblee Road and with the western line of Tract Three, as shown on book of maps 2020, page 866 , South $00^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 541.01 feet to a point on the northern line of lands now or formally owned by Linda W. and Phillip Killette, as described in deed book 8407, page 888; thence with the common line of Killette and others, South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 3101.18 feet to a point on the eastern line of lands now or formally owned by Rebecca H. Hinton, as described in deed book 2244, page 189; thence with the common line of Hinton and others, North $02^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 1937.74 feet to an axle, being the southwest corner of lands now or formally owned by Carolyn P. Chamblee, as described in estate file 2578, page 00-E; thence with the common line of Chamblee and others, North $88^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 3001.95 feet to an iron pipe on the western line of Tract One, as shown on book of maps 2020, page 866; thence with said common line, South $00^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 1404.20 feet to the point and place of beginning; containing an area of 5,918,772 square feet or 135.88 acres.

# Town of Zebulon 

# PLANNED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION 

## GENERAL INFORMATION:

A Planned Development in accordance with Section 2.2.13 and 3.5.5 of the UDO is intended to provide flexibility by establishing site specific regulations including permitted uses, dimensional standards, phasing schedules and additional details to allow for a development that is better than what would otherwise be permitted under the strict interpretation of the UDO. All site-specific standards and conditions must be consistent with the objectives of these regulations, the adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Transportation Plan, and Vision 2030 Strategic Plan. The review process established in this part provides for the accommodation of such uses by a reclassification of property into a Planned Development, subject to site-specific standards and conditions.

## INSTRUCTIONS:

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING: A pre-application meeting with staff in accordance with Section 2.3 .2 of the UDO to verify the application requirements, processes, and procedures regarding a proposed request. To schedule a meeting, applicants must e-mail a pdf map, drawing, model, site or sketch plan to Assistant Planning Director Meade Bradshaw (mbradshaw@TownofZebulon.org) no later than five (5) working days prior to the desired meeting day.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING: Neighborhood meetings are required in accordance with Section 2.3.4 of the UDO prior to application submission. The applicant is required to notify property owners and any neighborhood association that represents citizens within that area within 300 feet of the subject property via first class mail a minimum of 10 days in advance of the neighborhood meeting. The applicant shall use their own return address on the envelopes as the meeting is a private meeting between the developer and the neighbors. The applicant shall submit the "Certified List of Property Owners" and "Neighborhood Meeting Packet" forms included in this application packet with their initial submittal.

ANNEXATION REQUIREMENTS: If a property or portion thereof subject to this rezoning is outside the corporate limits and ETJ, an annexation petition is required to be submitted on the same day as this application in accordance with section 2.2.2 of the UDO.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE - The applicant requesting a Planned Development must submit a written application to the Zebulon Planning Department using the forms included in this packet.

- Completed Application Form
- 8 Full Size Plan Sets and 1 PDF set on USB drive. (see site plan checklist)
- Comprehensive Planned Development Document
- Petition Fee (Please See Fee Schedule)
- One (1) Legal Description (metes and bounds) of subject property
- Registered survey of subject property
- Certified List of Property Owners within 150 feet of subject property
- Owner's Consent Form
- Neighborhood Meeting Packet
- Stamped envelopes addressed to Certified List of Property Owners all the homeowners associations of those properties within 150 feet of the outer boundary subject property or properties affixed with the following return address:

Town of Zebulon Planning Department 1003 N. Arendell Ave Zebulon, NC 27597

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURE - Upon submittal of a complete application, the Planning Department will schedule the application for a joint public hearing before the Planning Board and the Board of Commissioners. APPLICANTS ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO CONTACT PLANNING STAFF AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PUBLIC HEARING. Notices of the public hearing will be mailed to all adjacent property owners of the property being considered for a Planned Development Amendment. At the public hearing, the applicant, proponents, and opponents will be given the opportunity to offer evidence in favor of or against the proposal. After completion of the public hearing, the Planning Board will deliberate and forward its recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for final consideration. Deadline dates and Joint Public Hearing dates can be found on the Town of Zebulon's website.



## PART 3. PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

## Name of Property Owner:


(Jim P. Edwards, Tr.)
Street Address of Property Owner:
2711 ROOSTER ST


I hereby state that the facts related in this application and any documents submitted herewith are complete, true, correct, and accurate to the best of my knowledge.


## LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant shall propose site-specific standards and conditions that take into account the following considerations, which are considerations that are relevant to the legislative determination of whether or not the proposed planned development is in the public interest. Therese considerations do not exclude the legislative consideration of any other factor that is relevant to the public interest. Failure to adequately address the findings below may result in denial of the application. Please provide responses to the following standards as outlined in Section 2.2.13 of the Unified Development Ordinance.

1. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Development advances the public health, safety, or welfare

See attached Exhibit A.
2. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Development is appropriate for its proposed location, and is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the Town's adopted policy guidance.

## See attached Exhibit A.

3. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Development is reasonable and in the public interest.

See attached Exhibit A.
4. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for innovative land planning and site design concepts that support a high quality of life and achieve a high quality of development, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and other Town goals and objectives.

## See attached Exhibit A.

5. Please provide details on how the proposed planned unit development provides improved means of access, open space, and design amenities;

See attached Exhibit A.
6. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides a well-integrated mix of residential and nonresidential land uses in the same development, including a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and densities;

See attached Exhibit A.
7. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development creates a system of incentives for redevelopment and infill in order to revitalize established areas;

## See attached Exhibit A.

8. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development promotes a vibrant public realm by placing increased emphasis on active ground floor uses, pedestrian-oriented building façade design, intensive use of sidewalks, and establishment of public gathering areas;

See attached Exhibit A.
9. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets and thereby lowering development and housing costs; and

## See attached Exhibit A.

10. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and man-made features, such as trees, estuaries, shorelines, special flood hazard area, and historic features.
See attached Exhibit A.
11. Other factors as the Board of Commissioners may determine to be relevant.

See attached Exhibit A.

## OWNER'S CONSENT FORM

Name of Project: shamble Red Planned Development
Submittal Date:
11-1-22

## OWNER'S AUTHORIZATION

I hereby give CONSENT to D.R. Horton, McAdams (David Bargmakk) and Longlaaf Law Partners $\qquad$ (type, stamp or print clearly full name of agent) to act on my behalf, to submit or have submitted this application and all required material and documents, and to attend and represent me at all meetings and public hearings pertaining to the applications) indicated above. Furthermore, I hereby give consent to the party designated above to agree to all terms and conditions which may arise as part of the approval of this application.

I hereby certify I have full knowledge the property I have an ownership interest in is the subject of this application. I acknowledge and agree that, pursuant to Section 2.2.13. of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance, that lands subject to a Planned Development shall be subject to all the standards, conditions, and plans approved as part of that application. These standards, plans, and approved conditions are perpetually binding on the land as an amendment to this Ordinance and the Official Zoning Map, and may only be changed in accordance with the procedures established in this Ordinance. Development located outside the Town of Zebulon's corporate limits shall comply with all Town policies related to annexation and the extension of utilities. I understand that all other applicable standards and regulations of the UDO will remain applicable to the subject lands unless specifically listed as conditions or deviations as part of this request. I understand that any false, inaccurate or incomplete information provided by me or my agent will result in the denial, revocation or administrative withdrawal of this application, request, approval or permits. I acknowledge that additional information may be required to process this application. I further consent to the Town of Zebulon to publish, copy or reproduce any copyrighted document submitted as a part of this application for any third party. I further agree to all terms and conditions, which may be imposed as part of the approval of this application.


## CERTIFICATION OF PROPERTY OWNER



I hereby certify the statements or information made in any paper or plans submitted herewith are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand this application, related material and all attachments become official records of the Planning Department of the Town of Zebulon, North Carolina, and will not be returned.

*Owner of record as shown by the Wake County Revenue Department (www.wakegov.com). An option to purchase does not constitute ownership. If ownership has been recently transferred, a copy of the deed must accompany this form.

## CONCEPT PLAN REQUIREMENTS

Every applicant requesting Planned Development approval shall submit 8 copies and 1 pdf (email or USB Drive) of a concept plan drawing with the application for a Planned Development. The concept plan shall contain sufficient information to adequately determine the type of development being proposed. The concept plan drawing shall include, at a minimum, the following features unless otherwise specified by the Planning Department:

ITEM
1.

Plot plan showing all existing and planned structures, building setback lines, perimeter boundaries, and easements.
2. Elevation drawings of all buildings indicating the proposed exterior finish materials.
3. Landscaping plan, lighting, fencing, screening, and walls, indicating all heights and locations.
4. Location of all ingress and egress.
5. Off-street parking and loading facilities, with calculations showing how the quantities were obtained.
6. All pedestrian walks and open areas for use by residents, tenants, or the public.
7. Proposed land uses indicating areas in square feet.
8. The location and types of all signs, including lighting and heights, with elevation drawings.
9. Existing and/or proposed street names.
10. Proposed potable or reuse water, wastewater connections, and storm sewer line; proposed grading and drainage patterns; proposed water and sewer allocations.
11. Such additional items and conditions, including design standards as the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners deems necessary.
12. Trip generation data and TIA

CHECK IF SUBMITTED



## PROPOSED USES

An application has been duly filed requesting that the property described in this application be rezoned from R -30 (Wake County) to Planned Development (PD) . It is understood and acknowledged that if the property is rezoned as requested, the property described in this request will be perpetually bound to the use(s) authorized and subject to such conditions as imposed, unless subsequently changed or amended as provided for in the Unified Development Ordinance. It is further understood and acknowledged that final plans for any specific development to be made pursuant to any such Planned Development shall be submitted for site or subdivision plan approval. Use additional pages as needed.

The Rezoned Lands may be used for, and only for, the uses listed immediately below. The permitted uses are subject to the limitations and regulations stated in the Use Table and any additional limitations or regulations stated below. For convenience, some relevant sections of the Unified Development Ordinance may be referenced; such references do not imply that other sections of the Unified Development Ordinance do not apply.

| 1. | Single Family Detached Dwelling | 25. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Single Family Attached Dwelling | 26. |  |
| 3. | Accessory Dwelling Unit | 27. |  |
| 4. | Cluster Box Unit | 28. |  |
| 5. | Detached Accessory Structure | 29. |  |
| 6. | Guard House, Shelter, or Gatehouse | 30. |  |
| 7. | Home Occupation | 31. |  |
| 8. | Play Equipment | 32. |  |
| 9. | Swimming Pool/Hot Tub | 33. |  |
| 10. | Tool/Storage Shed | 34. |  |
| 11. |  | 35. |  |
| 12. |  | 36. |  |
| 13. |  | 37. |  |
| 14. |  | 38. |  |
| 15. |  | 39. |  |
| 16 |  | 40. |  |
| 17. |  | 41. |  |
| 18. |  | 42. |  |
| 19. |  | 43. |  |
| 20. |  | 44. |  |
| 21. |  | 45. |  |
| 22. |  | 46. |  |
| 23. |  | 47. |  |
| 24. |  | 48. |  |

## Planned Development

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

The applicant hereby requests that the Zebulon Board of Commissioners, pursuant to Section 3.3.5 of the Unified Development Ordinance, approve the Proposed Planned Development with above listed uses), subject to the following conditions), requested deviations, and proposed alternative means of compliance. (Attach additional pages as needed)

See Section 5 of Planned Devdopment Document. Architerfiral design commitments are in Section 3( pg 28).
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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## ADJACENT OWNERS

Provide a certified list of property owners subject to this application and all properties owners within 150 -feet feet of the subject property, and any HOA Contacts for developments which fall within 300 -feet of the subject property.

| Parcel Address | Parcel ID Number | Owner's Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| See Attached List | 200' Baffer applied. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## HOA CONTACTS

| Development Name | Contact Person | Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N / A$ | $N / A$ | $N / A$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Certified List of Property Owners (Wake Co. Real Estate Records) - 200 ft buffer applied (instead of 150) to be conservative.

 (NOTE: stamped envelopes provided for this full list)| SITE_ADDRESS |
| :--- |
| 1101 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| 1404 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 10405 PERRY RIDGE CT | 1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 504 PERRY CURTIS RD 929 PERRY CURTIS RD 833 PERRY CURTIS RD 905 PERRY CURTIS RD 1108 FIELD MEADOWS DR 1512 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD O PERRY CURTIS RD

1520 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 10401 PERRY RIDGE CT



 $\qquad$ 1501 CARROLI HEIGHTS RD
 708 PERRY CURTIS RD

 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY 10303 PERRY RIDGE CT 1413 CHAMBLEE RD $\qquad$
 0 CHAMBLEE RD 706 PERRY CURTIS RD

 ZEBULON NC 27597-8155 ZEBULON NC 27597-9640
 ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 ZEBULON NC 27597-2807 RALEIGH NC 27608-1529 ZEBULON NC 27597-9641
 ZEBULON NC 27597-8881 ZEBULON NC 27597-9668 RALEIGH NC 27604-3839 ZEBULON NC 27597-6845 ZEBULON NC 27597-6842 ZEBULON NC 27597-9669
 ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018 ZEBULON NC 27597-2626 ZEBULON NC 27597-8881 DDR1 1101 FIELD MEADOWS DR 1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 504 PERRY CURTIS RD 929 PERRY CURTIS RD 833 PERRY CURTIS RD 929 PERRY CURTIS RD 255 DAVIS RD 1512 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 2333 ZEBULON RD 1520 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 10401 PERRY RIDGE CT 10413 PERRY RIDGE CT 10409 PERRY RIDGE CT 10417 PERRY RIDGE C 409 S ARENDELL AVE 1501 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 1532 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD 708 PERRY CURTIS RD 1408 CHAMBLEE RD 1922 TRAWICK RD 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY 10303 PERRY RIDGE CT 1104 FIELD MEADOWS DR 2099 GAITHER RD STE 600 204 W GANNON AVE 706 PERRY CURTIS RD

| 2715213285 | TELLEZ MAGANA, MARIA TERESA | 1508 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD | ZEBULON NC 27597-9640 | 1508 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2715212128 | WALL, JODY C | 133 W 1ST ST | WENDELL NC 27591-7600 | 1417 CHAMBLEE RD |
| 2714189947 | HOAD, RYAN PATRICK HOAD, JAMIE LEIGH | 10421 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6844 | 10421 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2714085959 | NUNEZ, RICARDO RODRIGUEZ, ANGELICA MARIA | 10301 PERRY RIDGE CT | ZEBULON NC 27597-6842 | 10301 PERRY RIDGE CT |
| 2714091017 | OLVERA, RAMON HERNANDEZ | 1100 FIELD MEADOWS DR | ZEBULON NC 27597-6852 | 1100 FIELD MEADOWS DR |
| 2714495712 | DRSFA LLC | 2099 GAITHER RD STE 600 | ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018 | 1701 CHAMBLEE RD |

## Dory Meadows Legal Description

Being all of the land described in deed book 1789, page 402 in the Durham County Register of Deeds. Being more particularly described as:

Beginning at a point on the northern right of way line of Chamblee Road (a 60 foot public right of way), being the southwest corner of Tract One as shown on book of maps 2020, page 866 in the Durham County Register of Deeds, the point of beginning; thence across the right of way of Chamblee Road and with the western line of Tract Three, as shown on book of maps 2020, page 866 , South $00^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 541.01 feet to a point on the northern line of lands now or formally owned by Linda W. and Phillip Killette, as described in deed book 8407, page 888; thence with the common line of Killette and others, South $89^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 3101.18 feet to a point on the eastern line of lands now or formally owned by Rebecca H. Hinton, as described in deed book 2244, page 189; thence with the common line of Hinton and others, North $02^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 1937.74 feet to an axle, being the southwest corner of lands now or formally owned by Carolyn P. Chamblee, as described in estate file 2578, page 00-E; thence with the common line of Chamblee and others, North $88^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 3001.95 feet to an iron pipe on the western line of Tract One, as shown on book of maps 2020, page 866; thence with said common line, South $00^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 1404.20 feet to the point and place of beginning; containing an area of 5,918,772 square feet or 135.88 acres.

## Exhibit A: Dory Meadows Planned Development Application Responses

1. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Development advances the public health, safety, or welfare.

Response: The proposed Planned Development will provide a much-needed supply of housing in a regional market that is chronically undersupplied - resulting in significant housing affordability issues due to skyrocketing home prices. Furthermore, the proposed location of this development will result in a safe and convenient neighborhood within a 5-minute drive to the Zebulon Community Park, shopping in downtown Zebulon, and a local fire station and EMS station. The development will be within a 10-minute drive of the local police station and all levels of grade schools. Finally, with over $1 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of the gross acreage retained as open space, the proposed Planned Development will help protect environmental health and promote a more active lifestyle.
2. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Development is appropriate for its proposed location, and is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the Town's adopted policy guidance.

Response: Though this development would constitute a satellite annexation, it abuts a previously approved satellite annexation known as Sidney Creek. Thus, municipal services are already being extended to this area. Furthermore, as indicated in Response \#1, this site is less than a 10 minute drive to the areas schools, downtown shopping, and public safety facilities.

The adopted Future Land Use Map designates this area as Suburban Residential (SR). and identifies one of the Primary Land Use Types for Suburban Residential as, "Planned developments that integrate other housing types (e.g., attached residential such as patio homes or townhomes) [in addition to Detached residential dwellings], with increased open space to preserve an overall suburban character." Thus, the proposed Planned Development with a mix of SFD detached dwellings, attached dwellings, and over $1 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of gross acreage as open space precisely fits the intended use and place type within the SR FLU designation.

Furthermore, this Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
a. [Land Use and Development - Goal 1] - "A land use allocation and pattern that advances Zebulon's objectives of achiever greater housing variety $\qquad$ with convenient resident access to schools, recreation, shopping and Services."
i. Supporting Statement(s):

1. The site is located within a 5 -minute drive to Zebulon Community Park, Downtown Zebulon Shopping, Fire Station, and EMS station and less than 10 minutes from Zebulon elementary, middle, and high school.
2. The proposed development includes a mix of rear-loaded homes SFD homes, front-loaded SFD homes, and Townhomes, providing a variety of housing options to suit different needs.
b. [Land Use and Development - Goal 3] - "Ongoing and effective collaboration between land use and transportation planning to ensure a well-connected community with adequate means and capacity to accommodate multiple forms of circulation between local destinations."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
3. The proposed Planned Development incorporates a new E-W collector road free of driveways, which will ultimately form a new connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis road to the west. This new route will form a travel alternative to the current Perry Curtis Road connection to Chamblee road - one with significantly improved access management and which aligns through the Planned Development directly to the Sidney Creek subdivision to the east. This new collector road, through its future westward extension, could be designed as the main E-W throughway to Chamblee road in lieu of the current Perry Curtis Road connection, or it could " $T$ " into Perry Curtis Road. This decision could be made in the future based upon traffic needs at that time and with coordination with NCDOT.
c. [Land Use and Development - Policy C] - "Emphasize compatible intensities and character when evaluating applications involving more intensive and/or nonresidential development near existing homes and neighborhoods.
i. Supporting Statement(s):
4. The proposed Planned Development locates its denser Townhome units closer to Chamblee Road, where existing infrastructure is most capable of serving it. Furthermore, the location of townhomes on the east side of Chamblee Road connects to proposed Townhomes to be established as a future phase of the Sidney Creek development. Detached single family home lots are proposed along most of the project perimeter, where the proposed PD abuts existing subdivisions such as the Perry Creek and Fieldcrest Meadow subdivisions to the south. A riparian buffer and additional undisturbed open
space is left along the site's northern boundary where it abuts the Carroll Heights subdivision.
d. [Land Use and Development - Policy D] - "Promote land use outcomes that further community objectives for preventing traffic congestion, ensuring more pedestrianand cyclist-friendly design, and support expanded and viable public transit options."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
5. As explained under the response for Goal 3 for Land Use and Development, the proposed E-W collector road will be unloaded with driveways and will enhance both vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity. Additional trail networks within the site's open space will further support recreational bicycle and pedestrian use.
e. [Land Use and Development - Policy E] - "Ensure development design respects the area's environmental assets and resource base, including waterways and their riparian buffers, unique landscapes, and mature tree stands, especially where there is potential for greenway and/or blueway acquisition."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
6. As proposed the Planned Development retains approximately $1 / 3$ rd of the site as open space (both passive and active). The site design integrates and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a 5+ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter.
f. [Land Use and Development - Policy G] - "Ensure that all residential developments have multiple access points for public safety reasons and circulation options."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
7. The proposed Planned Development has multiple access points along Chamblee Road, connects to a future phase of the Sidney Creek approved development to the east, and connects to Perry Curtis Road via an the existing stub of Ridge Valley Way to the south. Roadway stubs will also be provided in 2 locations along the northern property boundary - to be extended at the time of future development.
g. [General Policy - G1] - "Land uses should not detract from the enjoyment or value of neighboring properties."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
8. All proposed uses are residential in nature, abutting existing residential uses or vacant land. A Type B buffer ( $20^{\prime}$ width) is provided along the project perimeter (either as preserved vegetation or new plantings).
h. [General Policy - G3] - "Adequate transportation access and circulation should be provided for uses that generate large numbers of trips. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be addressed where appropriate."
i. Supporting Material:
9. The proposed Planned Development incorporates a new E-W collector road free of driveways, which will ultimately form a new connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis road to the west. This new route will form a travel alternative to the current Perry Curtis Road connection to Chamblee road - one with significantly improved access management and which aligns through the Planned Development directly to the Sidney Creek subdivision to the east.
10. Sidewalks shall be provided along all proposed streets and offstreet pedestrian trails shall be provided to improve access to the site's natural features and active open spaces.
i. [General Policy - G6] - "Environmentally sensitive areas should be protected, including wildlife habitat areas."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
11. The proposed site design avoids any new vehicular crossings of riparian buffers, as well as works around a significant (>10 acre) wetland area in the southeastern portion of the site. Pedestrian access is provided to these areas to allow for community enjoyment and exposure to nature, but otherwise they are left undisturbed.
j. [Residential Policy - R1] - "Residential areas should not be located next to heavy industrial areas."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
12. All adjacent zoning and existing uses are residential or agricultural in nature. No industrial areas are located adjacent to the proposed planned development.
k. [Residential Policy - R3] - "Schools, parks and community facilities should be located close to or within residential neighborhoods.
i. Supporting Statement(s):
13. The site has over 4 acres of private/active open space proposed within the residential neighborhood.
14. The site is within a 5-minute drive to Zebulon Community Park, Downtown Zebulon Shopping, a Fire Station, and an EMS station.
15. The site is less than a 10-minute drive to elementary, middle, and high schools.
I. [Residential Policy - R4] - "Houses should have direct access to local residential streets but not to collector streets or thoroughfares.
i. Supporting Statement(s):
16. No driveways are located along the site's proposed E-W collector road. All dwelling units have direct access to a local residential street or an alley.
m. [Residential Policy - R7] - "New residential developments should include adequate area for parks and recreation facilities, schools and places of worship.
i. Supporting Statement(s):
17. The site has over 40 acres open spaces, including over 4 acres of private, active open space.
n. [Parks and Open space Policy - P5] - "Natural features should be used as buffers or preserved open space between or around developed areas."
i. Supporting Statement(s):
18. The proposed Planned Development utilizes both riparian buffers and wooded woodlands to provide natural buffers between developed areas.
19. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Development is reasonable and in the public interest.

Response: As indicated in the responses above, the proposed uses and density is aligned with the adopted Future Land Use Map and place types intended for the suburban residential designation. The site is adjacent to an large existing satellite annexation, meaning urban services have already been extended to this area and the extension of those services to this development will not incur any disproportionate ongoing costs to service agencies (police, fire, public works, etc.). Finally, the site protects a significant amount of natural areas, while providing an east-west collector road free of driveways to facilitate connectivity and ease the amount of traffic utilizing a portion of Perry Curtis road which does not have nearly as good access management as the proposed development.
4. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for innovative land planning and site design concepts that support a high quality of life

## and achieve a high quality of development, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and other Town goals and objectives.

Response: The propose Planned Development utilizes the natural features of the site as an asset to be built around, rather than as an obstacle to overcome. The site design integrates and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a $5+$ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter. Existing wetlands and riparian buffers are preserved and used along the northern and southern property boundaries as natural perimeter buffers.

The proposed E-W collector street provides improved access and connectivity at a scale that does not split the community in terms of pedestrian cross-access. Furthermore, the absence of driveways along this collector street allows for a much more aesthetically pleasing and pedestrian friendly streetscape for the development's primary connecting street.
5. Please provide details on how the proposed planned unit development provides improved means of access, open space, and design amenities.

Response: The proposed layout provides 3 points of access along Chamblee Road, 3 local street stubs to be extended when future development is proposed, a connection which aligns with the proposed Sidney Creek street layout to the east and will provide direct access to Chamblee Road for this adjacent development, and a new collector street that when extended through 1 additional property to the west will provide an improved alternative to a portion of Perry Curtis Road for east-west movement.

Active open spaces are distributed throughout the development for convenient access and are located along the site's major internal roadway. The main amenity utilizes the large existing lake as a significant site feature. Architectural design standards are proffered for the development, as outlined in the Planned Development document.
6. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides a well-integrated mix of residential and nonresidential land uses in the same development, including a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and densities.

Response: Due to the future land use plan's 'Suburban Residential' designation for this area, non-residential land uses are not included in the overall layout. However, the site does include a mix of housing types, lot sizes, lot orientations, and densities in the form of single family detached dwellings and townhomes. Details on dimensional standards for the sites different residential products are contained in the associated Planned Development document.
7. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development creates a system of incentives for redevelopment and infill in order to revitalize established areas.

Response: The proposed development is primarily surrounded by vacant land, creating an incentive for 'development' rather than 'redevelopment', as roadway and utility extensions included as part of this project make adjacent development more viable. Redevelopment opportunities in this area would likely be more limited to potential future pedestrian improvements in an existing adjacent neighborhood.
8. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development promotes a vibrant public realm by placing increased emphasis on active ground floor uses, pedestrian-oriented building façade design, intensive use of sidewalks, and establishment of public gathering areas.

Response: The layout for the proposed development is intentional in terms of its creation of public gathering areas in the form of active and passive open spaces. The primary amenity is centrally located within the development along the site's primary internal road and backing up to a large lake. This amenity will serve as the heart of this neighborhood, where both formal and informal events are held.

In addition to the site's active open spaces, the proposed Planned Development will have an extensive pedestrian trail system that facilitates the use of it's public gathering areas. All local new roads shall have sidewalks on both sides.
9. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets and thereby lowering development and housing costs.

Response: The proposed layout preserves approximately $1 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of its acreage as passive or active open space. The result of this type of layout is a more condensed
development pattern with smaller lots served by less linear feet of infrastructure, surrounded by a significant amount of common open space in lieu of larger individual yards. The interconnected road network is only limited by the numerous environmental features which this site must accommodate.
10. Please provide details on how the proposed Planned Unit Development provides quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and man-made features, such as trees, estuaries, shorelines, special flood hazard area, and historic features.

Response: As mentioned in previous responses, the site design preserves and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a 5+ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter.

Existing wetlands and riparian buffers are preserved and used along the northern and southern property boundaries in locations as natural perimeter buffers. Where these existing features are not present along the project perimeter, a minimum Type B Buffer is proposed.

To better align with nearby development, the site's Townhomes are clustered on the eastern side of the development, adjacent to approved Townhomes to be built as part of the Sidney Creek development.
11. Other factors as the Board of Commissioners may determine to be relevant.

Response: The inclusion of some front-loaded townhomes within the development helps create a more diverse and economically resilient residential offering and supports housing affordability by avoiding rear-loaded alleys within this segment.

Please refer to the associated Planned Development document for more information on proposed architectural conditions.

## OWNER'S CONSENT FORM

Name of Project: shamble Red Planned Development
Submittal Date:
11-1-22

## OWNER'S AUTHORIZATION

I hereby give CONSENT to D.R. Horton, McAdams (David Bargmakk) and Longlaaf Law Partners $\qquad$ (type, stamp or print clearly full name of agent) to act on my behalf, to submit or have submitted this application and all required material and documents, and to attend and represent me at all meetings and public hearings pertaining to the applications) indicated above. Furthermore, I hereby give consent to the party designated above to agree to all terms and conditions which may arise as part of the approval of this application.

I hereby certify I have full knowledge the property I have an ownership interest in is the subject of this application. I acknowledge and agree that, pursuant to Section 2.2.13. of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance, that lands subject to a Planned Development shall be subject to all the standards, conditions, and plans approved as part of that application. These standards, plans, and approved conditions are perpetually binding on the land as an amendment to this Ordinance and the Official Zoning Map, and may only be changed in accordance with the procedures established in this Ordinance. Development located outside the Town of Zebulon's corporate limits shall comply with all Town policies related to annexation and the extension of utilities. I understand that all other applicable standards and regulations of the UDO will remain applicable to the subject lands unless specifically listed as conditions or deviations as part of this request. I understand that any false, inaccurate or incomplete information provided by me or my agent will result in the denial, revocation or administrative withdrawal of this application, request, approval or permits. I acknowledge that additional information may be required to process this application. I further consent to the Town of Zebulon to publish, copy or reproduce any copyrighted document submitted as a part of this application for any third party. I further agree to all terms and conditions, which may be imposed as part of the approval of this application.


## CERTIFICATION OF PROPERTY OWNER



I hereby certify the statements or information made in any paper or plans submitted herewith are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand this application, related material and all attachments become official records of the Planning Department of the Town of Zebulon, North Carolina, and will not be returned.

*Owner of record as shown by the Wake County Revenue Department (www.wakegov.com). An option to purchase does not constitute ownership. If ownership has been recently transferred, a copy of the deed must accompany this form.



## ZEBULON UTILITY ALLOCATION WORKSHEET

## BASE POINTS: List of Preferred Land Uses and Required Characteristics:

The uses listed below have been determined to be the most desirable and important uses for the Town of Zebulon to promote and maintain economic and housing diversity. Only projects that completely meet the stated performance characteristics will be considered for utility allocation.

|  | Use | Points Earned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 Base Points | Business Office/Finance/Insurance/Professional Services Center - Large Qualifying projects must exceed 100,000 square feet of heated floor space and create at least 150 employment positions that exceed the average annual Wake County salary according to Wake County Economic Development or the Employment Security Commission. Employees perform professional, scientific, and technical services for others. Such services require a high degree of expertise and training and provide high salaried employment opportunities. Examples include software engineering, legal, medical, accounting, consulting, architectural, biomedical, chemical, research and development, and administrative services. Finance or Insurance Centers shall also pool financial risks by underwriting insurance and annuities. Some establishments support employee benefit programs. Examples include bank or credit union headquarters, brokerages, investments, insurance, financing, and data processing establishments. |  |
| 40 Base Points | Manufacturing/Industrial Employment Center <br> Manufacturing or Industrial establishments in this category exceed 200,000 square feet of floor space located in plants, factories, or mills and employ power-driven machines and materials-handling equipment. They may also employ workers who assemble or create new products by hand, without the characteristic machinery-intensive enterprise. Many manufacturing establishments process products of agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying as well as products of other manufacturing establishments. Most manufacturing establishments have some form of captive services (e.g., research and development, and administrative operations, such as accounting, payroll, or management) in conjunction on-site. |  |
| 40 Base Points | Governmental Uses/Public Administration <br> This category encompasses centers for all government functions; it includes federal, state, and local government agencies that administer, oversee, and manage public programs and budgets and have executive, legislative, or judicial authority. Establishments develop policy, create laws, adjudicate civil and criminal legal cases, and provide for public safety and national defense. |  |
| 38 Base Points | Hotels, Motels, or other Accommodation Service Establishments This category serves lodging and short-term accommodations for travelers. They may offer a wide range of services, from overnight sleeping space to full-service hotel suites. They may offer these services |  |


|  | in conjunction with other activities, such as entertainment or recreation. Stays in these establishments are generally less than one month. This classification does not include boarding or rooming houses. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 38 Base Points | Arts/Entertainment/Museums <br> These establishments operate facilities or provide services for a variety of cultural, entertainment, and performing art functions. Establishments include those that produce, promote, or participate in live performances, events, or exhibits intended for public viewing; those that preserve and exhibit objects and sites of historical, cultural, or educational interest; and those that operate facilities or provide services to serve activities associated with the aforementioned. |
| 38 Base Points | Amusement, Sports or Recreational Establishment <br> Establishments in this category operate either indoor or outdoor facilities offering family activities (i.e. sports, recreation, or amusement) and provide services, such as facilitating amusement in places operated by others, operating recreational sports groups and leagues. Examples include golf courses, indoor sports venues, bowling alleys, miniature golf courses, athletic clubs, skating rinks and arcades. This category may be used in conjunction with a commercial or residential development as a mixed use development. |
| 38 Base Points | Mixed Use Development (Transit Oriented) <br> Newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated collection of vertically mixed retail, office and residential uses in multi-story buildings centered within a one-quarter mile radius of an existing rail or bus transit station or the intersection of First Avenue and Robertson Street in Old Town Knightdale. In order to qualify as mixed use, developments must dedicate at least one-third of the total heated square footage to residential use and the remainder to a mix of retail and office uses. All three use types must be represented and at least $10 \%$ of the heated square footage must be dedicated to street level, storefront retail uses. |
| 38 Base Points | Mixed Use Development (Urban Infill) <br> Newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated collection of vertically mixed retail, office and residential uses in a multi-story building on a previously developed parcel within the corporate limits. In order to qualify as mixed use, developments must dedicate at least one-third of the total heated square footage to residential use and the remainder to a mix of retail and office uses. All three use types must be represented and at least $10 \%$ of the heated square footage must be dedicated to street level, storefront retail uses. |
| 35 Base Points | Mixed Use Development (Greenfield) <br> Newly constructed collection of vertically mixed retail, office and residential uses in a multi-story building or buildings on a previously undeveloped parcel. In order to qualify as mixed use, developments must dedicate at least one-third of the total heated square footage to residential use and the remainder to a mix of retail and office uses. All three use types must be represented and at least $10 \%$ of the heated square footage must be dedicated to street level, storefront retail uses. |


| 30 Base Points | Single Family House (Expedited Subdivision or Recombination) Newly constructed Single Family Homes built upon new lots created via the expedited subdivision (3 or fewer lots) or recombination process. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 Base Points | Change of Use <br> This category captures renovation, rehabilitation, up-fit or retrofit of existing buildings or portions of buildings that pre-date this policy and require a code summary sheet, change in building occupancy, certificate of occupancy, building permit and/or building inspections. |  |
| 30 Base Points | Housing Services for the Elderly Establishments <br> This category offers housing services for the aged, not requiring a license from the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, such as independent retirement housing, multi-unit assisted housing with services (MAHS), and continuing care retirement centers. All facilities must provide, but not necessarily be limited to, the following services/facilities: On-site laundry facilities, on site management, guaranteed transportation services at least four days per week, on-site exercise facilities, on-site computer access, and a clubhouse/common lounge area for all residents. |  |
| 28 Base Points | Mixture of Use Development (Retail/Office-Institutional/Commercial) Newly constructed collection of horizontally arranged uses including retail, office-institutional and commercial within a master planned project on a previously undeveloped parcel or parcels totaling at least 10 acres. Mixture of use projects must include at least two (2) use types with at least $25 \%$ of the space devoted to each use type included in the development. |  |
| 28 Base Points | Retail/Commercial Center <br> Newly constructed center of at least 50,000 square feet, typically containing an anchor such as a grocery store and other smaller spaces and/or outparcels for subordinate uses. Uses are entirely consumerdriven and include all manner of retail, service and office possibilities. |  |
| 28 Base Points | Business Office/Finance/Insurance/Professional Services Center Medium <br> Qualifying projects must exceed 50,000 square feet of heated floor space and create at least 75 employment positions that exceed the average annual Wake County salary according to Wake County Economic Development or the Employment Security Commission. Employees perform professional, scientific, and technical services for others. Such services require a high degree of expertise and training and provide high salaried employment opportunities. Examples include software engineering, legal, medical, accounting, consulting, architectural, biomedical, chemical, research and development, and administrative services. Finance or Insurance Centers shall also pool financial risks by underwriting insurance and annuities. Some establishments support employee benefit programs. Examples include bank or credit union headquarters, brokerages, investments, insurance, financing, and data processing establishments. |  |
|  |  |  |


| 28 Base Points | Warehouse/Distribution/Trucking Center <br> Newly constructed center of at least 500,000 square feet where products and resources are transported to, stored, and delivered from via truck or rail. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 Base Points | Business Office/Finance/Insurance/Professional Services Center - Small <br> Qualifying projects 50,000 square feet of heated floor space or less. Employees perform professional, scientific, and technical services for others. Such services require a high degree of expertise and training and provide high salaried employment opportunities. Examples include software engineering, legal, medical, accounting, consulting, architectural, biomedical, chemical, research and development, and administrative services. Finance or Insurance Centers shall also pool financial risks by underwriting insurance and annuities. Some establishments support employee benefit programs. Examples include bank or credit union headquarters, brokerages, investments, insurance, financing, and data processing establishments. |  |
| 25 Base Points | Multi-Tenant Retail Center <br> Newly constructed center 50,000 square feet or less, typically containing a more than one tenant space within a single structure. Uses are entirely consumer-driven and include all manner of retail, service and office possibilities |  |
| 25 Base Points | Religious Institutions <br> Any facility such as a church, temple, synagogue, mosque or monastery used for worship by a non-profit organization and their customarily related uses. |  |
| 20 Base Points | Single Use Retail <br> Newly constructed single use, stand-alone building used primarily for retail, restaurant, or similar commercial use. |  |
| 20 Base Points | Single Use Office <br> Newly constructed single use, stand-alone building used primarily for office and professional. |  |
| 15 Base Points | Intensive Industrial Uses <br> Uses classified as Special Land Uses within the Industrial Classification. |  |
| 10 Base Points | Major Subdivision <br> Any subdivision of land of five (5) or more lots. | 10 |
| 10 Base Points | Multi-Family Residential \& Condo Units |  |
| Board <br> Determination | All Other Uses Not Categorized <br> This category of use captures all other uses not categorized elsewhere. Allocations for such uses are left to the discretion of the Town Council upon recommendation of the Land Use Review Board and acted on a case-by-case basis. |  |

## BONUS POINTS

Proposed projects can gain BONUS POINTS by agreeing to provide any of the following items over and above the UDO or Standard Specification requirements for their development proposal.

NOTE: No bonus points are given for UDO requirements.
CATEGORY 1 - Non-Conformity Abatement and Public Infrastructure Improvements (Max 20 Points)

| Section 1A - Abatement of Nonconformities | (Max-3 points) | Points Earned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abatement of any existing non-conforming structures | 3 |  |
| Abatement of any existing non-conforming use of land | 2 |  |
| Abatement of any existing non-conforming lots | 1 |  |
| Section 1B - Roadway Infrastructure Not Warranted by TIA/UDO | (Max - 10 points) |  |
| Construction of full cross section of existing off-site public street | 5 |  |
| Nearby intersection improvements | 5 |  |
| Traffic signal improvements | 4 |  |
| Signage or striping improvements | 1 |  |
| Section 1C - Off-Site Public Greenway Improvements | (Max - 10 points) |  |
| Construct more than 4000 linear feet of 10 -foot wide path | 10 |  |
| Construct more than 3000 linear feet of 10 -foot wide path | 8 |  |
| Construct more than 2000 linear feet of 10 -foot wide path | 6 |  |
| Construct more than 1000 linear feet of 10 -foot wide path | 4 |  |
| Construct 500 to 1000 linear feet of 10 -foot wide path | 2 |  |

## CATEGORY 2. Green Development Standards

(Max 20 Points $) \longleftarrow$ Please note that the maximum for this section is 20 Pts.

| Section 2A - Conservation of Natural Habitat Meeting Active Open Space Requirements as Defined in the UDO | (Max - 10 points) | Points Earned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| One point per acre up to 10 acres | 1-10 | 10 |
| Section 2B - Parking Lots and Stormwater SCM's | (Max-10 points) |  |
| Structured Parking Facilities - must reduce footprint by 20\% | 10 |  |
| Stormwater - Restored Riparian Buffer | 10 |  |
| Construct a fountain or other stormwater amenity within the BMP/SCM <br> (as approved by Staff) | 4 |  |
| Stormwater - Landscaped Green Roof | 5 |  |
| Stormwater - Underground capture system for on-site irrigation | 5 |  |
| Stormwater - Bioretention | 5 |  |
| Stormwater - Wetland | 5 |  |
| Exclusive use of porous pavement in parking areas where suitable | 2 |  |
| Provision of on-street public parking(1 point per stall up to 5 Max) | 1-5 | 5 |
| Section 2C-Building/Site Design | (Max - 20 points) |  |
| Residential Architectural Standards to include the Building Types: |  |  |
| House \& Townhouse (respectively)* | 10 | 10 |
| Historic Structure Preservation via Deed Restriction (Determined by TRC) | 10 |  |
| Platinum LEED Certification | 10 |  |
| Gold LEED Certification | 8 |  |
| Silver LEED Certification | 6 |  |


|  | Redevelopment of previously vacant space over 20,000 square <br> feet | 6 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Development or Redevelopment within Downtown Overlay <br> District | 6 |  |
|  | Redevelopment of previously vacant space under 20,000 square <br> feet | 5 |  |
|  | Neighborhood/Subdivision LEED Certification | 5 |  |
|  | Green Homes LEED Certification | 5 | 4 |
|  | Exclusive use of xeriscaping techniques and drought tolerant <br> species | 3 |  |
|  | EV Charging Stations (two-port) | 3 |  |
| *Bilding Types are defined in Article 5 of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance. |  |  |  |

## CATEGORY 3 - Outdoor Enhancement and Transit Improvements

(Max 20 Points)

| Section 3A - Outdoor Enhancement |  | (Max - 10 points) | Points Earned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Construction of a Parkway Street Section on a Collector level <br> street | 5 |  |
|  | Construction or Preservation of Gateway Landscaping or Structure <br> (Subject to Comprehensive Plan Consistency and TRC approval) | 5 | 5 |
|  | Restoration of Historic Structure (Must be approved by TRC) | 5 |  |
|  | Installation of Fountain or mechanical aeration in stormwater <br> pond | 5 |  |
|  | Outdoor Display of Public Art (Subject to TRC Approval) | 4 |  |
|  | Maintenance of Roadside Gateway Plant Bed (requires <br> maintenance agreement) | 3 |  |
|  | Planting Pollinator Garden (225 Square Foot Minimum) | 3 |  |
|  | Enhanced Roadside Landscaping (Subject to TRC Approval) | 2 |  |
|  | Construction of a Parkway Street Section on a Local level street | 2 |  |
|  | Installation of Native Shade Tree Species (per Tree) | 1 |  |
| Section <br> active transit route) | (Max - 8 points) |  |  |
|  | Provision of more than 50 designated Park \& Ride Stalls | 8 |  |
|  | Provision of 25 designated Park \& Ride Stalls | 5 |  |
|  | Provision of 10 designated Park \& Ride Stalls | 3 |  |
|  | Provision of mass transit easement w/ structure (bus stop with <br> shelter \& bench) | 2 |  |

CATEGORY 4 - Amenities (Only for Projects with Residential Components)
(Max 20 Points)

| Section 4A - Private Greenway |  | (Max - 3 points) | Points Earned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Construction of more than 3000 linear feet of 6-foot wide path | 3 |  |
|  | Construction of more than 2000 linear feet of 6-foot wide path | 2 |  |
|  | Construction of more than 1000 linear feet of 6-foot wide path | 1 |  |
| Section 4B $\boldsymbol{-}$ Pool (Combinations may be approved by TRC) | (Max - 8 points) |  |  |
|  | Olympic Pool and Aquatic Center | 8 |  |


| Junior Olympic Pool | 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lap Pool (four lane minimum) | 3 |  |
| Resort Style Pool | 2 | 2 |
| Any Other Pool | 1 |  |
| Section 4C - Outdoor Deck/Patio | (Max-3 points) |  |
| Deck/Patio - More than 3000 square feet | 3 |  |
| Deck/Patio - More than 2000 square feet | 2 |  |
| Deck/Patio - More than 1000 square feet | 1 | 1 |
| Section 4D - Pool Amenities | (Max-2 points) |  |
| Jacuzzi/Hot Tub/Whirlpool | 2 |  |
| Water Playground with apparatus | 2 | 2 |
| Sauna/Steam room | 2 |  |
| Section 4E - Clubhouse | (Max - 10 points) |  |
| Commercial Coffee Shop with at least 10 designated public seating spaces | 10 |  |
| With full kitchen and over 4000 square feet of meeting space | 10 |  |
| With full kitchen and less than 4000 square feet of meeting space | 9 |  |
| Meeting space without kitchen more than 3500 square feet | 8 |  |
| Meeting space without kitchen 2500-3499 square feet | 7 |  |
| Meeting Space without kitchen 1500-2499 square feet | 5 |  |
| Meeting Space without kitchen less than 1500 square feet | 4 |  |
| No meeting space, bathrooms and changing rooms only | 3 | 3 |
| Section 4F - Additional Active Recreation | (Max - 10 points) |  |
| Gymnasium (regulation size indoor basketball court) | 10 |  |
| Baseball/Softball Field (regulation size) | 5 |  |
| Football/Soccer Field (regulation size) | 5 |  |
| Skate Park | 5 |  |
| Tennis Courts (two regulation courts, fenced) | 5 |  |
| Multi-Use Hardcourt (two regulation basketball courts, fenced) | 5 |  |
| Pickleball Court (three regulation courts, fenced) | 5 |  |
| Pocket Park - 8,000 square feet | 5 | 5 |
| IPEMA Certified Playground Equipment | 4 | 4 |
| Lighted Field of Play for nighttime use | 3 |  |
| Electronic Scoreboard or Covered Dugouts or Bleachers | 3 |  |
| Community Garden - 15-foot by 15-foot, with water access and potting shed | 3 |  |


| Total Points <br> Earned |
| :---: |
| 60 |


[^0]:    **Meetings shall occur between 5:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m. on a Monday through Thursday (excluding Town recognized holidays). If you have questions about the general process for this application, please contact the Planning Department at 919-823-1809. You may also find information about the Zebulon Planning Department and on-going planning efforts at https://www.townofzebulon.org/services/planning

[^1]:    1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
    2. Level of service for minor-street approach.
[^2]:    Background Improvements by Sidney Creek are shown underlined.

    1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
    2. Level of service for minor-street approach.
